DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 449 253 UD 033 937

AUTHOR	Sullivan, Ashley F.
TITLE	Hunger in the United States: A Summary of Recent Studies on Hunger and Emergency Food Demand.
INSTITUTION	Brandeis Univ., Waltham, MA. Food Security Inst.
PUB DATE	2000-08-00
NOTE	59p.
AVAILABLE FROM	Center on Hunger and Poverty, Heller Graduate School, Brandeis University, Mailstop 077, P.O. Box 549110, Waltham, MA 02454-9110. Tel: 781-736-8885. Fax: 781-736-3925. e-mail: hunger@brandeis.edu. Web site: http://www.centeronhunger.org.
PUB TYPE	Reference Materials - Bibliographies (131) -- Reports - Research (143) -- Tests/Questionnaires (160)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Children; Family Problems; Homeless People; *Hunger; *Poverty; Research Reports; State Programs; Urban Problems; Welfare Recipients
IDENTIFIERS	Emergencies; *Food Security; Food Supply; State Policy; Welfare Reform

ABSTRACT

This is an annotated resource guide for those interested in recent hunger and food insecurity studies. Objectives, methods, and key findings of each study are summarized, and contact information for obtaining the report is given. Studies are grouped by survey location and listed chronologically by publication or release date within each geographic category. Location and subject indexes are provided to help navigate the material. The location index differentiates studies with a national or multi-state purview from those focusing on communities within individual states. Study summaries are grouped into three categories: measuring food needs and hardship in general populations, emergency food recipients and provider efforts, and the impact of changes in public assistance programs on food security. Studies were published or released since 1998 and were based on data gathered no earlier than 1995. Summaries of key findings are limited to aspects directly related to food security. Studies are noteworthy for their large volume and extensive geographic diversity, variety of food insecurity and hunger issues investigated, and heterogeneity of approaches employed to evaluate hunger and food insecurity nationwide. An appendix presents the USDA's Food Security Core Module, a validated survey instrument for assessing household food security. (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 449 253

Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University

Hunger in the United States

A Summary of Recent Studies on Hunger and Emergency Food Demand

August 2000

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. L. Brown
Center on Hunger, Poverty, Brandeis Univ.

2A TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

UD033937

Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University

Hunger in the United States

A Summary of Recent Studies on Hunger and Emergency Food Demand

Ashley F. Sullivan
August 2000

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty

As of July 1, 2000 the Center on Hunger and Poverty, along with the Food Security Institute and the Asset Development Institute, relocated to Brandeis University. Initial research for this document began at Tufts University, prior to our departure from that institution, and we wish to gratefully acknowledge its support.

Food Security Institute
Center on Hunger and Poverty
Heller Graduate School
Brandeis University
Mailstop 077
Waltham, MA 02454

Tel: 781-736-8885
Fax: 781-736-3925
URL: www.centeronhunger.org
Authors' E-mail:
afs@brandeis.edu
seavey@brandeis.edu

Table of Contents

INTRODUCTION 1

INDICES 7

- Index by Study Type 7
- Index by Study Location 12

STUDY SUMMARIES 16

- Measuring Food Needs and Hardship in General Populations 16
- Emergency Food Recipients and Provider Efforts 21
- The Impact of Changes in Public Assistance Programs on Food Security 34

APPENDIX: USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM) 50

Introduction

National data from the federal government indicate that food insecurity and hunger are persistent problems in the United States and that their extent and severity are no longer so directly modulated by economic cycles. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) reports that 10.5 million households experienced food insecurity in 1998 and nearly 3.7 million of these experienced hunger.[1] These household figures translate into a total of 36 million individuals – 40 percent of them children – living in households where, due to insufficient resources to acquire food, there is uncertain access to food or actual deprivation. Paradoxically, these compelling data come in the midst of record low unemployment and unprecedented economic growth.[2]

Within this national picture, state and local governments along with private organizations across America want to know how hunger is manifested in their own regions and communities: Who is affected? How bad is their situation? Is it getting worse? And what are the characteristics of those who are impacted? This report summarizes over fifty studies conducted since 1998 in twenty-two states. While all of the studies investigate various aspects of hunger and food insecurity among low-income populations, some have a national purview, others are multi-state, but the majority focus on local communities.

How to Use This Report

This report is designed to be used as an annotated resource guide for organizations and individuals interested in following recent hunger and food insecurity studies. The objectives, methods, and key findings of each study are briefly summarized along with the contact information needed to obtain the report.

Studies are grouped by survey location and listed chronologically by publication or release date within each geographic category. Two indices are provided to help the reader navigate the material – a *Location Index* and a *Subject Index*. The location index differentiates the studies with a national or multi-state purview from those that focus on communities within individual states.

---

[1] Bickel, Gary, Carlson, Steven, and Nord, Mark. (July 1999). *Household Food Security in the United States 1995 - 1998 (Advance Report).* Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/foodsec98.PDF.

[2] Venner, Sandra H., Sullivan, Ashley F. and Seavey, Dorie (January 2000). *Paradox of Our Times: Hunger in a Strong Economy.* Medford, MA: Center on Hunger and Poverty, Tufts University.

Organization of Report and Criteria for Inclusion of Studies

The study summaries presented in this report are grouped into the following categories:

- Measuring Food Needs and Hardship in General Populations
- Emergency Food Recipients and Provider Efforts
- The Impact of Changes in Public Assistance Programs on Food Security

The common purpose of the first group of studies – *Measuring Food Needs and Hardship in General Populations* – is to investigate the extent of hunger and food hardship in fairly broad populations compared to more narrowly defined target groups such as people receiving emergency food assistance or welfare benefits. This section presents four national studies followed by studies from two states.

The second set of studies – *Emergency Food Recipients and Provider Efforts* – focuses on the emergency food system. Demand for emergency food assistance is a telling indicator of food hardship. Typically, individuals and families seek out emergency food programs when they are unable to meet their food needs after pooling resources from their own households, federal food programs (if they are eligible and choose to participate), and friends and family. This literature is also concerned with the ability of food banks, soup kitchens and food pantries to meet the needs of individuals and families. Four of the studies in this section have a national orientation and eighteen have a specific state or local focus. Roughly half of the state studies focus directly on the clients receiving emergency food, and seek to understand the characteristics and degree of food insecurity and hunger experienced by these households. The remaining studies report on provider surveys that document changes in the demand for emergency food and the obstacles they face in meeting this demand.

The final group of studies – *The Impact of Changes in Public Assistance Programs on Food Security* – addresses the well-being of individuals and families no longer receiving welfare or general relief assistance benefits, either because they lost their eligibility for benefits or otherwise lost program assistance. Two national studies are included, both based on the Urban Institute's National Survey of American Families. Eighteen state-based studies are summarized from thirteen different states. Most of the studies in this section compare the food-related circumstances of current and former recipients. Many also provide information about the receipt of other types of food assistance, such as food stamps and private emergency food assistance, and often compare the receipt of these forms of assistance before and after benefit loss.

A few explanations regarding the studies included in this compendium are in order. First, studies were selected if they were published or released since 1998 *and* were based on data gathered no earlier than 1995. Second, this report focuses on studies which employ methods other than the USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM), a validated survey instrument for assessing household food security available in a full 18-item form and also an abbreviated 6-item form (see the Appendix on the FSCM).

Because of their shared methodological orientation, FSCM studies are summarized in other Food Security Institute reports. Third, for many of the studies included in this compendium, collecting information related to hunger and food insecurity was only a part – and sometimes only a small part – of their overall purpose. Summaries of each study's key findings are limited in this report to those aspects directly related to food security. Finally, studies investigating the effects of food insecurity and hunger on health, nutrition, and behavioral outcomes among populations in the U.S. were excluded. Published largely in scientific journals, this research area is growing in part because the FSCM has now been incorporated into several large specialized federal data-gathering efforts, some of which specifically investigate the health and nutrition outcomes of respondents.[3] Ultimately, these data-gathering efforts will improve our understanding of the "costs" of food insecurity and hunger, both to individuals and to society as a whole.

Methodological Comments

Empirical studies of household and individual food security in the U.S. can be divided into two broad groups. One group takes what we call the "red flag approach." Here, respondents typically are asked from one to three questions about their household's food circumstances, usually as part of a larger focus on the overall economic well-being of the household. Examples of these questions include: Has there ever been a time when you were unable to buy food? Were there instances when someone in your household skipped at least one meal because they did not have enough money to buy food? Was there ever a time when an adult or child in your household went hungry? Affirmative answers to these questions can be interpreted as "red flags" *suggesting* the possible presence of food insecurity or even hunger.

The second approach is exemplified by the FSCM. This instrument consists of a systematically derived set of scaled indicator questions which identify and measure household food insecurity through its complete range of severity. The questions ask about a household's experiences of increasingly severe circumstances of food insufficiency and behaviors undertaken in response to them during the twelve months preceding the survey. The key strengths of the measure are that: 1) its multiple indicator questions capture the full range of severity of food insecurity and hunger, 2) the determination of the household's food security status is a function of its *overall* pattern of response to the set of indicator questions rather than its response to individual items, 3) local FSCM findings can be directly compared to national, regional, state and local standard benchmark data, and 4) the findings can be used to monitor changes over time in food security including progress made toward achieving established goals.

---

[3] The FSCM has now been incorporated into the 5-year longitudinal Survey of Program Dynamics (SPD), the Early Childhood Longitudinal Study (ECLS), the USDA Continuing Survey of Food Intakes by Individuals (CSFII), and the 4th National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES-4).

Note that these two approaches have distinct although possibly related purposes, and produce findings that have very different kinds of empirical power and uses. Data from the "red-flag" approach can be used to tabulate such things as the proportion of respondents who skipped a meal or were unable to afford food. If a high proportion of respondents indicate skipping a meal or being unable to afford food, then these findings *suggest* food hardship. However, a single or small set of indicator-type questions cannot be expected to capture a meaningful *range* of the behaviors and experiences associated with food insecurity, food insufficiency, or food hardship. The FSCM ideally is used when the purpose is to determine the extent and severity of food insecurity and hunger within a community or broad population, such as a state or region. Data from the FSCM can be used to calculate prevalence rates for a complete set of sub-ranges of food security and insecurity (e.g., food insecurity with moderate versus severe hunger).

The current collection of studies exemplifies the "red flag" approach. The key methodological characteristics of these studies are as follows:

Question formulation: There is wide variation in the choice and formulation of either single or small sets of "red-flag" questions concerning food hardship and deprivation. Of the state and local studies summarized in this report, over a third employ a single question concerning food hardship. The "welfare leaver" studies show the greatest variation in the number of questions asked: of the 22 studies reviewed, 23 percent use one question, 9 percent use two, 27 percent use three, and 32 percent use between four and six questions.

Time period: Considerable variation also exists in the time period selected for investigation: some studies ask respondents about their food security over a twelve-month period while others inquire about the last six months, the last thirty days, or a particular period since leaving welfare. In many of the "welfare leaver" studies, respondents were asked to compare their experiences before and after leaving welfare, but it is unclear how accurately respondents can recall their hunger experiences across two different time periods.[4]

Sample design: The vast majority of local studies reviewed in this report were based on convenience samples taken at social service sites where vulnerable populations are likely to seek assistance. Roughly 26 percent of these studies administered surveys in-person at the study site; about 36 percent relied on telephone surveys; 24 percent on mailed surveys; and 13 percent used a combination of in-person and telephone surveys. The sample sizes for studies of emergency food recipients ranged from 216 to 735, and from 102 to 4,529 for the "welfare leaver" studies.

---

[4] Isaacs, Julia B. *Monitoring Outcomes for Former Welfare Recipients: A Review of 11 Survey Instruments* (August 1999). Paper presented at the National Association for Welfare Research and Statistics (NAWRS) 39th Annual Workshop in Cleveland, Ohio. Available at: http://aspe.hhs.gov/hsp/nawrs99/jisaacs-main.htm.

Concluding Remarks

Three things stand out about this collection of evidence on hunger and food insecurity in the United States:

- The impressive volume of reports and their extensive geographic diversity,
- The variety of food insecurity and hunger issues investigated, and
- The heterogeneity of approaches employed to evaluate hunger and food insecurity in the nation.

The vast majority of the fifty studies summarized in this report document problems that low-income individuals and families across the country have obtaining enough food to meet their needs. Conducted over the course of the last five years, most of these studies reflect the impact of stresses on the economic security of low-income households largely attributable to two powerful sets of forces: profound state-based transformations of the U.S. social welfare system brought about welfare reform instituted in the mid-1990s, and the workings of unprecedented economic growth and prosperity on labor markets and wages, the affordability of basic household needs, and economic inequality.

The wide variety of hunger and food insecurity issues explored in this collection is also noteworthy and provides a rich source of information. Over 40 percent of the studies summarized in this report investigate the impact of welfare reform changes on the food security status of former recipients, and, as such, represent the earliest phase of efforts to describe and monitor the effects of welfare devolution on the food security of low-income individuals and families across America. Nearly half of the studies focus on a problem of increasing concern over the past five years – the growing need on the part of individuals and families for emergency food supplies and the resulting stress on the nation's private network of emergency food providers to meet this need.

The diversity of topics investigated in the reports summarized is exceeded only by the heterogeneity of methods used to collect information. There is little commonality in the research design or tools utilized across the studies summarized in this report. The empirical power of these studies is limited by their use of different questions and time periods, even when similar phenomena are under investigation. But, precisely because of the volume of evidence indicating food insecurity and hunger in the nation, it is very important to work towards greater research standardization in the future. A growing body of survey research in this field employs the USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM).[5] To date, five years of national data have been gathered by the U.S. Census

[5] The Food Security Institute reported on studies using the FSCM in another publication released in April 1999 (see the Appendix for the full reference), and in the Fall 2000, an update will be issued covering studies released in the last year and a half.

Bureau and about a dozen state and local studies have been conducted using the new instrument.[6]

It is significant that so many studies concerned with the economic well-being of low-income populations chose to include at least one question intended to serve as an indicator of food insecurity or hunger. Collectively, the studies included in this compendium reflect the deep concern of state and local organizations with mounting evidence of persistent hunger and food insecurity, and, within some communities and populations, their apparent increase. To our knowledge, such a volume of evidence is unparalleled since the early 1980s.

While data from these studies cannot be used to estimate the prevalence of food insecurity and hunger, they *can* serve to flag the existence of precarious conditions that are often associated with these problems. Many of these studies invite systematic follow-up using a standardized data collection instrument, ideally the USDA's FSCM. The key challenge for future data-gathering efforts is to continue to promote the inclusion of food security-related questions in survey studies while strengthening their empirical power and the comparability of the evidence collected. Credibly gathered data on food insecurity and hunger can play a critical role in galvanizing and focusing the attention of the public and the media, as well as shaping the response of public officials to policies that impact the economic security of low-income households.

Dorie Seavey and Ashley Sullivan are Director and Program Coordinator of the Food Security Institute at the Center on Hunger and Poverty.

[6] A derivative 6-item survey instrument has also been developed which is ideal for research efforts that have limitations on the number of questions that can be administered. The chief trade-off associated with using this abbreviated instrument is a loss of information about child hunger. See the Appendix for further resources.

Index by Study Type

Title	Release Date	Page #
Measuring Food Needs and Hardship in General Populations		
National		
• Snapshots of America's Families - Income and Hardship: Food Concerns and Affordability – *The Urban Institute*	January 1999	16
• Extended Measures of Well-Being: Meeting Basic Needs – *U.S. Census Bureau*	June 1999	16
• Homelessness: Programs and the People the Serve – *The Urban Institute*	February 2000	17
• Racial and Ethnic Disparities: Key Findings from the National Survey of America's Families – *The Urban Institute*	February 2000	18
New York		
• New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities – *Columbia University School of Social Work*	February 1999	19
Oregon		
• Oregon Population Survey 1998 – *Oregon Department of Administrative Services and the Oregon Progress Board*	March 1999	19
• How Many Hungry Oregonians? Measuring Food Insecurity and Hunger – *Oregon Center for Public Policy*	November 1999	20
Emergency Food Recipients and Provider Efforts		
National		
• Hunger 1997: The Faces and Facts – *America's Second Harvest*	March 1998	21
• Catholic Charities USA 1997 Annual Survey – *Catholic Charities USA*	December 1998	21
• Parish Social Ministries 1999 Welfare Reform Survey – *Catholic Charities USA*	March 1999	22
• A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities – 1999 – *U.S. Conference of Mayors*	December 1999	22
Multi-State		
• Poverty Amid Plenty: The Unfinished Business of Welfare Reform – *NETWORK's National Welfare Reform Watch Project*	April 1999	23

Alabama

- Private Food Assistance in East Alabama: Issues of Access and Need – *Auburn University* — December 1999 — 24

Arizona

- Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts – Arizona State Report – *America's Second Harvest and the Association of Arizona Food Banks* — March 1998 — 25

Connecticut

- Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Provider Survey – *The Connecticut Association for Human Services* — May 1999 — 25
- Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Site User Survey – *The Connecticut Association for Human Services* — May 1999 — 26

Maryland

- 1999 Emergency Service Provider Survey – *Center for Poverty Solutions* — January 2000 — 26

Massachusetts

- Hidden Hunger, Fragile Futures – *Project Bread and the Center on Hunger and Poverty* — November 1998 — 27

Michigan

- Food Pantries and Welfare Reform: Estimating the Effect – *Institute for Research on Poverty* — Fall 1999 — 27

New Jersey

- Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network Statewide Hunger Survey 1998 – *Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network* — Fall 1998 — 28

New York

- Who Feeds the Hungry? Mapping New York City's Emergency Food Providers – *Food for Survival, Inc.* — July 1999 — 28
- Full Coffers, Empty Plates: Children Go Hungry in a City of Plenty – *New York City Coalition Against Hunger* — October 1999 — 29

Oregon

- 1999 Hunger Relief Statistics (also includes Washington State information) – *Oregon Food Bank* — October 1999 — 29

Pennsylvania

- Philabundance Agency Survey on Community Needs - *Philabundance* — June 1999 — 30

Virginia

- Soup Kitchen and Food Pantry Users – Who Are They? – *Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy* — March 1999 — 30
- It Takes More Than a Job – The Outlook for Virginians Leaving Welfare – — March 2000 — 31

Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy

Washington

- 13th Annual Client Survey – 1999 – *The Spokane Food Bank* — October 1999 — 31
- 1999 Hunger Relief Statistics (also includes Oregon information) – *Oregon Food Bank* — October 1999 — 29

West Virginia

- Meeting Necessity: A Statewide Survey of Food Pantries, Clothing Closets, Soup Kitchens, Shelters, Health Care, and Emergency Assistance Providers in West Virginia – *West Virginia Economic Justice Project* — October 1999 — 32

Wisconsin

- State of Milwaukee's Children Report – 1999 – *Start Smart Milwaukee!* — May 1999 — 33

The Impact of Changes in Public Assistance Programs on Food Security

National

- How Families That Left Welfare Are Doing: A National Picture – *The Urban Institute* — August 1999 — 34
- Current and Former Welfare Recipients: How Do They Differ? – *The Urban Institute* — November 1999 — 34

Arizona

- Arizona Cash Assistance Exit Study – *Arizona Department of Economic Security* — January 2000 — 36

California

- A Report on the Impacts of the Implementation of the Five Month Time Limit on General Relief Cash Benefits in Los Angeles County – *Shelter Partnership, Inc.* — April 1999 — 36
- The Impact of Time Limits on General Relief Recipients in Los Angeles County: Survey Findings – *UCLA, Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness, and the Institute for the Study of Homelessness and Poverty* — April 1999 — 37
- From War on Poverty to War on Welfare: The Impact of Welfare Reform on the Lives of Immigrant Women – *Equal Rights Advocates' Immigrant Women and Welfare Project* — April 1999 — 38

Connecticut

- Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Three-Month Survey Results – *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation* — September 1998 — 38

Florida

- After WAGES: Results of the Florida Study – *Florida State University* — March 1999 — 39

Georgia

- Georgia Welfare Leaver Study Initial Results – *Applied Research Center, Georgia State University* — December 1999 — 39

Illinois

- When Families Leave Welfare Behind - First Survey Findings – *Institute for Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Springfield and the School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign* — 1999 — 40
- Living With Welfare Reform: A Survey of Low-Income Families in Illinois – *Work, Welfare and Families and the Chicago Urban League with the Center for Urban Economic Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago* — January 2000 — 40

Massachusetts

- How Are They Doing? A Longitudinal Study of Households Leaving Welfare Under Massachusetts Reform – *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance* — April 1999 — 41
- Food Stamp Participation and Food Security of Households Leaving Welfare – *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance* — February 2000 — 42

Missouri

- The Study of Families Formerly Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Interim Report: 1999 Survey – *Midwest Research Institute for the Missouri Department of Social Services* — May 1999 — 43

Ohio

- How Are They Managing? A Six Month Retrospective of Cuyahoga Families Leaving Welfare – *Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University* — January 2000 — 4

South Carolina

- Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients: Cases Closed During January through March, 1998 – *South Carolina Department of Social Services* — June 1999 — 44

Texas

- Why People Leave Welfare II: An Expanded Follow-up Study of the Effects of Welfare Reform – *Texas Legislative Council* — December 1998 — 45

Washington

- Washington's TANF Single Parent Families After Welfare – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services* — 1998 — 45
- Major Findings from Washington's Third TANF Exit Survey – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services* — November 1999 — 46
- Washington's 1999 TANF Exiters and Current Recipients – Survey Results – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services* — November 1999 — 46
- A Study of Washington State TANF Leavers and TANF Recipients – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services* — March 2000 — 47

Wisconsin

- Initial Findings on the Impact of Wisconsin Works on Food Security and Employment – *Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee* — August 1998 — 48
- Survey of Those Leaving AFDC or W-2 January to March 1998, Preliminary Report – *Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development and the University of Wisconsin's Survey Research Laboratory* — January 1999 — 49

Index by Study Location

Title	Release Date	Page #
National Studies		
• Hunger 1997: The Faces and Facts – *America's Second Harvest*	March 1998	21
• Catholic Charities USA 1997 Annual Survey – *Catholic Charities USA*	December 1998	21
• Snapshots of America's Families - Income and Hardship: Food Concerns and Affordability – *The Urban Institute*	January 1999	16
• Parish Social Ministries 1999 Welfare Reform Survey – *Catholic Charities USA*	March 1999	22
• Extended Measures of Well-Being: Meeting Basic Needs – *U.S. Census Bureau*	June 1999	16
• How Families That Left Welfare Are Doing: A National Picture – *The Urban Institute*	August 1999	34
• Current and Former Welfare Recipients: How Do They Differ? – *The Urban Institute*	November 1999	34
• A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities – 1999 – *U.S. Conference of Mayors*	December 1999	22
• Homelessness: Programs and the People the Serve – *The Urban Institute*	February 2000	17
• Racial and Ethnic Disparities: Key Findings from the National Survey of America's Families – *The Urban Institute*	February 2000	18
Multi-State Studies		
• Poverty Amid Plenty: The Unfinished Business of Welfare Reform (includes CA, FL, IL, MA, MI, NJ, OH, PA, TX) – *NETWORK's National Welfare Reform Watch Project*	April 1999	23
State Studies		
Alabama		
• Private Food Assistance in East Alabama: Issues of Access and Need – *Auburn University*	December 1999	24
Arizona		
• Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts – Arizona State Report – *America's Second Harvest and the Association of Arizona Food Banks*	March 1998	25

• Arizona Cash Assistance Exit Study – *Arizona Department of Economic Security*	January 2000	36
California		
• A Report on the Impacts of the Implementation of the Five Month Time Limit on General Relief Cash Benefits in Los Angeles County – *Shelter Partnership, Inc.*	April 1999	36
• From War on Poverty to War on Welfare: The Impact of Welfare Reform on the Lives of Immigrant Women – *Equal Rights Advocates' Immigrant Women and Welfare Project*	April 1999	38
• The Impact of Time Limits on General Relief Recipients in Los Angeles County: Survey Findings – *UCLA, Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness, and the Institute for the Study of Homelessness and Poverty*	April 1999	37
Connecticut		
• Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Three-Month Survey Results – *Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation*	September 1998	38
• Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Provider Survey – *The Connecticut Association for Human Services*	May 1999	25
• Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Site User Survey – *The Connecticut Association for Human Services*	May 1999	26
Florida		
• After WAGES: Results of the Florida Study – *Florida State University*	March 1999	39
Georgia		
• Georgia Welfare Leaver Study Initial Results – *Applied Research Center, Georgia State University*	December 1999	39
Illinois		
• When Families Leave Welfare Behind - First Survey Findings – *Institute for Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Springfield and the School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign*	1999	40
• Living With Welfare Reform: A Survey of Low-Income Families in Illinois – *Work, Welfare and Families and the Chicago Urban League with the Center for Urban Economic Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago*	January 2000	40
Maryland		
• 1999 Emergency Service Provider Survey – *Center for Poverty Solutions*	January 2000	26
Massachusetts		
• Hidden Hunger, Fragile Futures – *Project Bread and the Center on Hunger and Poverty*	November 1998	27

• How Are They Doing? A Longitudinal Study of Households Leaving Welfare Under Massachusetts Reform – *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance*	April 1999	41
• Food Stamp Participation and Food Security of Households Leaving Welfare – *Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance*	February 2000	42
Michigan		
• Food Pantries and Welfare Reform: Estimating the Effect – *Institute for Research on Poverty*	Fall 1999	27
Missouri		
• The Study of Families Formerly Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Interim Report: 1999 Survey – *Midwest Research Institute for the Missouri Department of Social Services*	May 1999	43
New Jersey		
• Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network Statewide Hunger Survey 1998 – *Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network*	Fall 1998	28
New York		
• New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities – *Columbia University School of Social Work*	February 1999	19
• Who Feeds the Hungry? Mapping New York City's Emergency Food Providers – *Food for Survival, Inc.*	July 1999	28
• Full Coffers, Empty Plates: Children Go Hungry in a City of Plenty – *New York City Coalition Against Hunger*	October 1999	29
Ohio		
• How Are They Managing? A Six Month Retrospective of Cuyahoga Families Leaving Welfare – *Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change, Case Western Reserve University.*	January 2000	43
Oregon		
• Oregon Population Survey 1998 – *Oregon Department of Administrative Services and the Oregon Progress Board*	March 1999	19
• 1999 Hunger Relief Statistics (also includes Clark County, Washington information) – *Oregon Food Bank*	October 1999	29
• How Many Hungry Oregonians? Measuring Food Insecurity and Hunger – *Oregon Center for Public Policy*	November 1999	20
Pennsylvania		
• Philabundance Agency Survey on Community Needs - *Philabundance*	June 1999	30

South Carolina

• Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients: Cases Closed During January through March, 1998 – *South Carolina Department of Social Services*	June 1999	44

Texas

• Why People Leave Welfare II: An Expanded Follow-up Study of the Effects of Welfare Reform – *Texas Legislative Council*	December 1998	45

Virginia

• Soup Kitchen and Food Pantry Users – Who Are They? - *Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy*	March 1999	30
• It Takes More Than A Job – The Outlook for Virginians Leaving Welfare – *Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy*	March 2000	31

Washington

• Washington's TANF Single Parent Families After Welfare - *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services*	1998	45
• 13th Annual Client Survey – 1999 – *The Spokane Food Bank*	October 1999	31
• 1999 Hunger Relief Statistics (also includes Oregon information) – *Oregon Food Bank*	October 1999	29
• Major Findings from Washington's Third TANF Exit Survey – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services*	November 1999	46
• Washington's 1999 TANF Exiters and Current Recipients – Survey Results – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services*	November 1999	46
• A Study of Washington State TANF Leavers and TANF Recipients – *Washington State Department of Social and Health Services*	March 2000	47

West Virginia

• Meeting Necessity: A Statewide Survey of Food Pantries, Clothing Closets, Soup Kitchens, Shelters, Health Care, and Emergency Assistance Providers in West Virginia – *West Virginia Economic Justice Project*	October 1999	32

Wisconsin

• Initial Findings on the Impact of Wisconsin Works on Food Security and Employment – *Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee*	August 1998	48
• Survey of Those Leaving AFDC or W-2 January to March 1998, Preliminary Report – *Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development and the University of Wisconsin's Survey Research Laboratory*	January 1999	49
• State of Milwaukee's Children Report – 1999 – *Start Smart Milwaukee!*	May 1999	33

1 Measuring Food Needs and Hardship in General Populations

NATIONAL STUDIES

Snapshots of America's Families - Income and Hardship: Food Concerns and Affordability — **January 1999**

Author(s)	Daniel E. McKenzie and Stephen H. Bell. The Urban Institute, Child Trends, Westat.
Study Period	February - November 1997
Background	The Urban Institute's "Snapshots" series is based on data from the National Survey of America's Families (NSAF). Its purpose is to create a picture of family life, with particular attention to how low-income families' lives differ from the lives of children and adults in families with higher incomes. The NSAF is part of the Assessing the New Federalism project, which monitors and assesses the devolution of social programs from the federal to state and local levels. The information collected in the 1997 survey will serve as baseline data for this multiyear project.
Methodology	The 1997 NSAF was administered to a representative sample of 44,461 randomly selected households (with and without telephones) from 13 states (AL, CA, CO, FL, MA, MI, MN, NJ, NY, TX, WA, and WI). Low-income households were oversampled in order to obtain a clearer picture of this population. The adult most knowledgeable about the household provided information on children in the family. To assess food hardship, respondents were asked whether: (1) they or their families worried that food would run out before they got money to buy more; (2) the food they bought did run out; and (3) one or more adults ate less or skipped meals because there was not enough money for food. Some questions covered the family's situation at the time of survey administration, while others concerned the previous 12 months.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Approximately 25% of respondents lived in families that experienced "food hardship." Of these, 20% experienced shortages of food and 5% worried about shortages. • People in low-income families (below 200% of the poverty level) were significantly more likely to worry about food shortages or have difficulty affording food than those in families with higher incomes (50% vs. 14%). • More children than adults lived in households that worried about or had trouble affording food (32% vs. 23%). • Nationally, about 50% of low-income children lived in families that worried about or had difficulty buying food. Among the states sampled, this ranged from 61% in Texas to 47% in Wisconsin.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://newfederalism.urban.org/nsaf/income_a5.html.

Extended Measures of Well-Being: Meeting Basic Needs — **June 1999**

Author(s)	U.S. Department of Commerce, Economics and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau.
Study Period	October 1995 - January 1996

Background	This study presents results from the Basic Needs Supplement to the Survey of Income and Program Participation (SIPP). SIPP is a longitudinal survey of people at least 15 years old and is conducted at 4-month intervals by the Census Bureau. SIPP primarily collects data on labor force participation, jobs, income, and participation in federal assistance programs, although information on various special topics is collected on a rotating basis.
Methodology	The Basic Needs supplement is administered to one person from each sampled household and consists of questions relating to basic needs, food sufficiency, and income adequacy. Food sufficiency was assessed by asking about the kind and amount of food in the household, the length of food shortages, and the amount of money required to balance the food budget.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Almost 1 person in 20 (4.8%) lived in a household where members sometimes did not get enough to eat. Nearly one-fifth (18.8%) lived in households that either did not get enough or did not get the kind of foods they wanted to eat. • Households that did not get enough food to eat in the prior month reported that the average time they were short on food was over one week, with about $100 required, on average, for these households to balance their monthly food budget. • Food insufficiency was strongly associated with: ▪ Income - 11.2% of those in the lowest income quintile were in households that did not get enough to eat vs. 0.8% of those in the top income quintile. ▪ Age - 7.3% of children lived in households that did not have enough to eat vs. 1.9% of those 60 and above. ▪ Race and Hispanic origin – 3.2% of whites compared to 9.3% of blacks and 11.7% of Hispanics lived in households where there was not enough to eat. ▪ Gender of householder – 24.8% of female-headed households vs. 15.9% of male-headed households experienced food insufficiency. ▪ Health insurance coverage - 32.8% of those not insured vs. 14.7% of those insured experienced food insufficiency.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.census.gov/prod/99pubs/p70-67.pdf.

Homelessness: Programs and the People They Serve **February 2000**

Author(s)	Martha R. Burt, Laudan Y. Aron, Toby Douglas, Jesse Valente, Edgar Lee, Britta Iwen. The Urban Institute.
Study Period	October 1995 – November 1996
Background	The National Survey of Homeless Assistance Providers and Clients (NSHAPC) was conducted to gather information on homeless assistance programs and their clients located in 76 geographical areas.
Methodology	Data on 11,909 homeless assistance programs were collected through telephone interviews and a mail survey. A survey of 4,207 clients of assistance programs was conducted (54% of respondents were homeless at the time of the interview; 22% experienced homelessness in the past, but were not homeless at the time of the interview; and 24% were other service users who had never been homeless). Homeless assistance providers in each geographic area were randomly selected as were clients within each program. Clients were asked if they got enough food to eat, if they went hungry, ate once a day or less, and about difficulties associated with obtaining food.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity	• 58% of currently homeless clients reported at least one problem obtaining adequate food in the 30 days prior to the survey. Problems experienced by homeless respondents included eating one meal a day or less (20%); being hungry in the past 30 days, but not eating

Findings	because of an inability to afford food (39%); and going a whole day without eating anything sometime during the 30 days prior to the interview (40%). • Current and former homeless clients were more than twice as likely to report that they sometimes or often did not get enough to eat (28% and 25%, respectively) compared to poor respondents who were not homeless (12%). • Current homeless respondents were more likely than former homeless respondents to report being either hungry because of a lack of money to buy food (39% vs. 26%) or going a whole day without eating (40% vs. 33%).
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.urban.org/housing/homeless/homelessness.pdf.

Racial and Ethnic Disparities: Key Findings from the National Survey of America's Families — **February 2000**

Author(s)	Sarah Staveteig and Alyssa Wigton. Assessing the New Federalism, The Urban Institute.
Study Period	February - November 1997 (Some questions covered the family's situation at the time of survey administration while others concerned the previous 12 months or calendar year 1996.)
Background	This report examines social and economic disparities within and across racial and ethnic groups.
Methodology	See "Snapshots of America's Families - Income and Hardship: Food Concerns and Affordability," page 16.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Across all income groups, nonelderly Hispanic, black, and Native American respondents experienced "food hardship" at nearly twice the rate of white and Asian respondents. • The percentage of nonelderly in low-income families experiencing "food hardship" was lowest for Asians (36.9%) followed by whites (40.4%), Hispanics (55.0%), blacks (55.3%), and Native Americans (58.9%).
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://newfederalism.urban.org/pdf/anf_b5.pdf.

STATE STUDIES

New York

New York City Social Indicators 1997: A Tale of Many Cities — February 1999

Author(s)	Irwin Garfinkel and Marcia K. Meyers. Columbia University School of Social Work.
Study Period	July - November 1997
Background	This survey measures how households are faring in terms of human, financial and social assets, living conditions, adequacy of institutional supports, and satisfaction with city services.
Methodology	Adult respondents in 1,503 households completed telephone interviews in English or Spanish. The sample population included households in New York City and surrounding areas including New York, New Jersey, and Connecticut. Respondents were asked if there was a time when an adult or child in the household went hungry during the past 12 months.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 7% of all respondent households from New York City (N=1373) sometimes went hungry. • More than 1 out of 10 households (11%) in the Bronx reported that household members sometimes went hungry, while only 2% of households surveyed from Staten Island sometimes experienced hunger.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.columbia.edu/cu/ssw/projects/surcent/finalmaster.pdf.

Oregon

Oregon Population Survey 1998 — March 1999

Author(s)	Office of Economic Analysis, Department of Administrative Services, State of Oregon and the Oregon Progress Board.
Study Period	May – October 1998
Background	The Oregon Population Survey (OPS) is conducted biannually to measure the socioeconomic characteristics and opinions of Oregonians on a number of policy issues.
Methodology	The 1998 OPS measured food sufficiency by asking respondents in a telephone survey one question about their household's food situation in the 12 months prior to the questionnaire's administration. 4,816 households, representing 12,665 individuals, answered this question on the OPS.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Based on the OPS, 16% of households reported that they had enough to eat but not the kinds of food they want; 3% of households reported that they "sometimes" or "often" did not have enough to eat. 81% of households reported "always" having enough to eat and the kinds of food they wanted. • Just over half (51.2%) of households below the poverty level reported that they always have enough to eat and the kinds of food they want. • Respondents who were employed were slightly less likely to report that they always have enough to eat and the kinds of food they want compared to unemployed respondents (79.3% vs. 82.7%).
Obtaining the Report	Summary reports available at: http://www.osl.state.or.us/csimages/orepop/title.html. Food security data is available by calling (503) 986-0123.

How Many Hungry Oregonians? Measuring Food Insecurity and Hunger **November 1999**

Author(s)	Michael Leachman, Oregon Center for Public Policy.
Study Period	May – October 1998
Background	This report analyzes food security measurement options for the OPS and compares the USDA's and OPS's food insecurity prevalence for Oregon. The Oregon Population Survey (OPS) is conducted biannually to measure the socioeconomic characteristics and opinions of Oregonians on a number of policy issues.
Methodology	The 1998 OPS assessed food insecurity by asking respondents one question about their household's food situation in the 12 months prior to the questionnaire's administration. 4,816 households, representing 12,665 individuals, answered this question on the OPS. The USDA combined three years of data (1996-1998) from the Food Security Supplement to the Current Population Survey to determine state food insecurity prevalence.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Based on the OPS, 16% of households reported that they had enough to eat but not the kinds of food they want; 3% of households reported that they "sometimes" or "often" did not have enough to eat. The USDA estimates that 6.8% of households in Oregon were food insecure without hunger and 5.8% were food insecure with hunger. • This report estimates that 119,000 Oregonians did not have enough to eat based on OPS findings, while the USDA prevalence rate suggests that some 400,000 Oregonians experienced hunger or were at risk of hunger. • Findings from the 1998 OPS and the USDA suggest that hunger and food insecurity is a serious problem in Oregon. The OPS should incorporate a measure more similar to that used by the USDA since the survey questions and methods provide data that are more comprehensive and precise. This data will enable Oregon to create more effective public policy to address the problem of food insecurity and hunger.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.ocpp.org/1999/rpt991130.pdf.

2 Emergency Food Recipients and Provider Efforts

NATIONAL STUDIES

Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts — March 1998

Author(s)	America's Second Harvest.
Study Period	January - December 1997
Background	Second Harvest is the largest domestic hunger relief organization in the United States with a network of over 200 food banks and food-rescue programs. Second Harvest distributes food to 26 million Americans every year, 8 million of whom are children.
Methodology	11,240 agencies responded to a mail survey, providing information on 12,897 programs across the country. Personal interviews were conducted with 27,771 clients at 3,476 agencies.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Emergency food programs served over 21 million unduplicated people in 1997. Of those served, 64.2% were female; 37.8% were 17 years old or younger; 39.9% lacked a high school diploma; and 47.1% were white, followed by African Americans (32.1%) and Hispanics (14.6%). • 45.2% of food programs had to "stretch food" during the previous year and 75.9% of programs needed to add specific items to their inventory to ensure an adequate variety of products for distribution. • 67% of clients reported a household income of less than $10,000. • 78.5% of food program clients interviewed had "no resources for food" other than agency or government food programs. • 27.5% of clients reported that adults in their households missed meals in the 30 days prior to the survey because they did not have enough food or money to buy food. Of those households with children, 9.1% reported that children missed meals in the past month because they did not have enough food or money to buy food.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.secondharvest.org/policy/hungerstudy/ffhome.html.

Catholic Charities USA 1997 Annual Survey — December 1998

Author(s)	Catholic Charities USA.
Study Period	January - December 1997
Background	Catholic Charities USA's annual survey provides information on the types of social and emergency services provided; the number and characteristics of clients served; social policy and community organizing programs; parish social ministry activities; staffing of local agencies; and financial resources and expenditures in 1997.
Methodology	Using Catholic Charities USA's annual survey, 1,406 affiliated agencies provided information on activities in their service areas.

Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Affiliated agencies served approximately 10.6 million people in 1997, with 6.8 million of these clients seeking emergency services. Approximately 61% of emergency service clients sought food, 6% needed temporary shelter, and 33% received other emergency services. 84% of emergency service clients lived in households with incomes below the poverty line (about $16,404 for a family of four in 1997). • Between 1996 and 1997, the number of people seeking emergency food assistance dropped from 5.5 million to 4.2 million.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Catholic Charities at (703) 549-1390 or submit a request to: https://www.bizinfonet.com/catholiccharitiesusa.org/pubs/orderform.cfm.

Parish Social Ministries 1999 Welfare Reform Survey **March 1999**

Author(s)	Catholic Charities USA.
Study Period	January 1999
Methodology	Catholic Charities' parishes in 82 dioceses received a Welfare Reform Parish Impact Survey. Of the 69 responses, 51 came from three dioceses (Savannah, GA; Kansas City, MO; and Lansing, MI).
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 73% of respondents reported increases in emergency food demand, down 3% from the January 1998 survey. • The reported increases ranged from 10% to 145%, with an average increase of 38%.
Obtaining the Report	Summary available at: http://www.catholiccharitiesusa.org/Programs/Advocacy/letters/welfare/survey1999.html.

A Status Report on Hunger and Homelessness in American Cities – 1999 **December 1999**

Author(s)	U.S. Conference of Mayors.
Study Period	November 1998 – October 1999
Methodology	26 major cities whose mayors were members of the U.S. Mayors' Task Force on Hunger and Homelessness participated in the survey. In addition to surveying citywide changes in emergency food demand, this report examines homelessness, programs in cities to respond to hunger and homelessness, the availability of affordable housing for low-income individuals, and the future outlook for hunger and homelessness.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 85% of respondent cities reported a rise in emergency food assistance demand, with requests increasing by an average of 18% over the previous year. • For those cities reporting increases, the rising demand for emergency food ranged from 1% in Chicago to 45% in Los Angeles. • Nearly 60% of those requesting food assistance were either children or their parents and over two-thirds (67%) of adults requesting food assistance were employed. • In all cities surveyed, people relied upon emergency food assistance facilities not only during emergencies but also as a steady source of food over long periods of time. • Officials in virtually every city surveyed anticipated increased requests for emergency food assistance in the year ahead.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.usmayors.org/uscm/homeless/hunger99.pdf.

MULTI-STATE STUDIES

Poverty Amid Plenty: The Unfinished Business of Welfare Reform

CA, FL, IL, MA, MI, NJ, NY, OH, PA, TX
April 1999

Author(s)	NETWORK's National Welfare Reform Watch Project and four national religious organizations (Daughters of Charity United States Provinces, Institute of the Sisters of Mercy of the Americas, Federation of the Sisters of St. Joseph, and Pax Christi USA).
Study Period	829 cases collected in October 1997 (Phase I); 926 cases collected in March 1998 (Phase II); and 800 cases collected in October 1998 (Phase III).
Background	This project monitored the impact of new welfare legislation in 10 states in order to evaluate its effectiveness and limitations.
Methodology	Staff at 59 social service facilities administered surveys to 2,555 clients (16% of the cases were from soup kitchen or food pantry facilities). Each facility was asked to report on up to 30 cases during each phase, and return a questionnaire with information on facility characteristics. Surveys included questions on respondent demographics, employment, welfare participation, and quality of life issues including 3 questions about access to food. The report includes both statistical and anecdotal information.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 43% of respondents reported eating fewer meals or less per meal over the previous six months because of insufficient money for food. For respondents surveyed at soup kitchens or food pantries, this figure rises to 64% and 65%, respectively. • 24% of the total sample reported that their children missed meals or ate less per meal over the past six months because of a lack of money. 52% of soup kitchen clients and 42% of food pantry clients reported that this was true. • 41% of respondents with jobs reported going hungry in the previous 6 months, compared to 44% of those without jobs. • Employed respondents were as likely as unemployed respondents to report that their children suffered from a lack of food (22% vs. 25%) and health care (14% vs. 14%). • Among those who used soup kitchens (N=226), 74% relied on soup kitchens once a week or more; 59% ate in soup kitchens several times a week; and 28% of those using food pantries also relied on soup kitchens to get by, with 54% of these respondents using soup kitchens several times a week. • Latino respondents received fewer benefits and fared much worse than other ethnic groups. • 41% of respondents reported not having a telephone.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.networklobby.org/welfrept.pdf.

STATE STUDIES

Alabama

Private Food Assistance in East Alabama: Issues of Access and Need

December 1999

Author(s)	Patricia A. Duffy, Joseph J. Molnar, LaToya Claxton, Ginger Grayson Hallmark, L. Conner Bailey, and Steve Mikloucich. Department of Agricultural Economics and Rural Sociology, Auburn University.
Study Period	March – August 1999
Background	The purpose of this study was to: a) describe the characteristics, needs, and attitudes of users of the East Alabama Food Bank member agencies as well as eligible non-users, and b) assess the impact of the Food Stamp Program and welfare policy changes on low-income populations in Alabama.
Methodology	Case studies were completed for 6 urban and 6 rural East Alabama Food Bank member agencies located in 7 counties. In addition, interviews were conducted with a sample of 216 low-income residents, 96 of whom were food bank users and 120 who were not. These surveys assessed the respondent's demographic and economic characteristics, food assistance program participation, food security, and transportation issues. Food security was evaluated with 15 questions related to food availability and food purchasing.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Over 80% of all respondents reported that they "often" or "sometimes" ran out of money to buy food. • About one-fifth of rural and urban food pantry clients reported that adults in their household had gone a whole day without eating because of a lack of food sometime during the prior year. These figures were slightly lower for non-food pantry users in urban and rural areas (15% and 12%, respectively). • A small number of respondents said their children skipped meals because they did not have enough money to purchase food (responses ranged from 16% of urban non-users to 0% of urban food pantry users); however, no respondents indicated that their children had gone a whole day without eating. • Over 60% of both urban and rural users indicated that they used the pantry only "now and then." A small percentage of clients (10% of rural and 7% of urban users) reported receiving food from pantries on a weekly basis. • Rural food pantry users were significantly more likely than urban users to have received food assistance for a year or more (61% vs. 28%, respectively).
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.ext.msstate.edu/srdc/activities/duffy_finalreport.htm.

Arizona

Hunger 1997: The Faces & Facts – Arizona State Report — March 1998

Author(s)	America's Second Harvest and the Association of Arizona Food Banks (AAFB).
Study Period	January – December 1997
Background	The report presents the contribution of the AAFB to Second Harvest's national survey.
Methodology	Arizona's study involved: (1) a mail survey to all agencies that operate food programs supported by participating food banks (data obtained for 285 programs), and (2) a survey of 580 emergency food program clients. Questions about how often clients worry about the source of their next meal and the number of meals household members missed in the past month were asked to assess food security.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 18% of client respondents often or always worried about the source of their next meal; 35% sometimes worried; and 45% never or rarely worried. • 36% of client respondents reported that adults in their households missed meals in the month prior to the survey because they did not have enough food or money to buy food. • Of the 257 households with children, in 16% children missed meals because of a lack of food or money to buy food; 15% had both adults and children who missed meals in the month prior to the survey; 24% had adults who missed meals, but did not have children missing meals.
Obtaining the Report	To order the report contact: AAFB at (602) 278-5877 or 1-800-445-1914, or at infonet@azfoodbanks.org.

Connecticut

Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Provider Survey — May 1999

Author(s)	The Connecticut Association for Human Services (CAHS).
Study Period	October 1997 – October 1998
Methodology	Surveys were mailed to all emergency food sites that use the 3 major food banks in Connecticut (Food Share, CT Food Bank, and the Lower Fairfield County Food Bank). 128 emergency food sites from all 8 counties in Connecticut responded to the survey, a response rate of about 50%.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Of the 54% of sites that indicated a change in participation since last year, 74% reported an increase in participation (average increase was 24%); 23% reported a decrease in participation (average decrease was 13%); and 3% did not indicate a direction of change. • Almost 40% of respondents reported that they had to decrease the amount of food distributed in order to "stretch" food supplies at some point in time. • When asked if they ever turned clients away, 85% of sites reported they never had to turn people away from services.
Obtaining the Report	Contact Amy E. Sampson, Director, Research and Evaluation Unit at (860) 951-2212 ext. 278.

Connecticut Association for Human Services 1999 Emergency Food Site User Survey — **May 1999**

Author(s)	The Connecticut Association for Human Services (CAHS).
Study Period	January 1999
Methodology	Food site user surveys were sent to soup kitchens and food pantries serving at least 150 meals per week. Of the eligible 54 sites, 23 participated in the survey, and 390 surveys were returned. Surveys measured food security using the Radimer/Cornell Scale.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Approximately one-third (35%) of respondents had children. Of those families with 1 child, 74% reported child food insecurity. Among families with 2 or more children, 64% and 51% reported food insecurity among their children, respectively. • Of the food site users that answered individual food security questions, 74% were classified as food insecure. • Individuals whose first language was not English were more likely to be food insecure than native English speakers. Individual food security did not differ based on ethnicity, sex, living or working status, or source(s) of income. • 71% of respondents indicated that they used soup kitchens; 88% reported using food pantries. However, only 41% reported food stamp use. • The following reasons were given for not using food stamps: 30% were told they were not eligible; 23% said they did not know if they were eligible; 16% said the household had too much money or assets; 11% said they were ineligible for reasons other than money; 11% said they did not have reliable transportation; 4% said they were embarrassed to use food stamps; and 3% said they did not know what food stamps were.
Obtaining the Report	Contact Amy E. Sampson, Director, Research and Evaluation Unit at (860) 951-2212 ext. 278.

Maryland

1999 Emergency Service Provider Survey — **January 2000**

Author(s)	Center for Poverty Solutions.
Study Period	September 1998 – September 1999
Methodology	Surveys were mailed to 1,095 service providers in the Center for Poverty Solutions' database. 25% were returned.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Food pantries reporting the number of bags of groceries distributed cited a 47% increase in distribution between September 1998 and September 1999. • Soup kitchens experienced a 14% increase in the number of people served, with an 18% increase in the number of child recipients. • Food pantries reported a 28% increase in the number of individuals served, with a 10% increase in the number of children served.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.ctrforpovertysolutions.org/public/99esps.htm.

Massachusetts

Hidden Hunger, Fragile Futures - A Report on Child Hunger — **November 1998**

Author(s)	Project Bread and the Center on Hunger and Poverty.
Study Period	January - December 1997
Background	The objective of this study was to determine trends in the number of people in Massachusetts experiencing hunger and food emergencies.
Methodology	200 randomly selected emergency food pantries, soup kitchens, and shelter programs in the state received a mailed questionnaire. 98 respondents provided information on 115 food and shelter programs, with some organizations running more than 1 program.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 62% of provider respondents reported an increase in the total number of emergency food requests in 1997 compared to 1996. Of the programs reporting increases, requests for emergency food increased 22% compared to the previous year. • 49% of the programs said that the number of families with children under 18 requesting emergency food assistance increased in 1997. Over half (52%) of the clients requesting assistance during 1997 were families with children under age 18. • 9% of the programs reported that they turned away clients in need in 1997 because they did not have enough food.
Obtaining the Report	To order the report, contact Project Bread at 617-723-5000 or order on the web at: http://www.projectbread.org/mchivol.htm.

Michigan

Food Pantries and Welfare Reform: Estimating the Effect — **Detroit Fall 1999**

Author(s)	Peter Eisinger, Institute for Research on Poverty, *Focus*, Vol. 20, No. 3.
Study Period	December 1997 and December 1998
Background	The purpose of this study was to explore how much private food assistance demand has increased in the Detroit area in the wake of welfare reform measures, which rendered certain groups ineligible for food stamps and cut benefits for others.
Methodology	Of the 157 emergency food providers in the Detroit area, 92 provider agency directors were interviewed. 229 food pantry and soup kitchen clients were also interviewed.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Comparing December 1997 and 1998, 63 of 92 programs experienced an increase in the number of clients served. In addition, nearly one-fifth of provider respondents reported that food donations decreased over the study period and 30% reported steady donations. • Of those providers reporting increases, 41 (65%) cited cuts in food stamp benefits or "welfare reform" as the major causes of increased demand. The remaining respondents (30%) cited factors other than welfare reform as contributing to increases, such as job layoffs, unemployment, low-paying jobs, the harsh winter, and increased costs of living. • The author estimates that about 20% of the total sample of emergency food recipients entered the system for the first time as a result of welfare reform (the "welfare reform increment"). Approximately two-thirds of these new entrants were already receiving food stamps at the time of the interview but reported a decline in the amount of benefits received.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.ssc.wisc.edu/irp/pubs/foc203.pdf.

New Jersey

Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network
Statewide Hunger Survey 1998

Fall 1998

Author(s)	Statewide Emergency Food and Anti-Hunger Network (SEFAN), a project of the Center for Food Action. Statewide Network News.
Study Period	January 1996 - December 1997
Methodology	Of 700 surveys mailed to emergency food providers, 212 were returned (a response rate of 30%). In addition, combined data on a coalition representing 35 sites were used.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 72% of provider respondents reported that the number of people served remained the same or increased between 1996 and 1997. Among respondents reporting the number of food packages provided, 84% reported no change or an increase in the number of food packages distributed. • Overall, between 1996 and 1997, persons served by food pantries increased by 12%, the number of food packages provided by pantries increased by 11%, and persons served by soup kitchens increased by 10%. • Over the period 1990 to 1997, the number of people served by food pantries grew by 60%, and the average number of children served during this period increased 28%.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of Statewide Network News, contact SEFAN at (201) 569-1804.

New York

Who Feeds the Hungry? Mapping New York City's Emergency Food Providers

New York City
July 1999

Author(s)	Food for Survival, Inc.
Study Period	July 1997 - June 1998
Background	Of the 2.2 million people who lived below 125% of poverty in New York City, approximately 1 million received Food Stamps at the time of this study, only 55% of the people estimated to be eligible for this benefit. After record caseload declines, fewer than 700,000 New York City residents received public assistance at the time of this report's publication.
Methodology	Survey of emergency food providers and clients served by Food For Survival, Inc.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• During the study period, 30% of clients receiving emergency food from provider respondents in New York City were under age 17 while the elderly (65+) made up 20% of those served. • During the study period, 29% of providers reported that they were forced to temporarily close for an average of 42 days primarily due to lack of food and funding. An estimated 110,580 people were turned away due to insufficient resources. • During fiscal year 1998, the number of meals served increased by almost 10% compared to the previous year. • Over the period 1996 to 1998, the number of emergency food providers in New York City increased by 21%. • Of the clients surveyed, 29% were homeless or living in a shelter (compared to 16% from

	comparable national studies); 19% were living doubled-up with others; and 53% were living in their own housing (compared to 79% of emergency food recipients nationally).
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Food for Survival at (718) 991-4300 or nutri@foodforsurvival.org.

Full Coffers, Empty Plates: Children Go Hungry in A City of Plenty

New York City
October 1999

Author(s)	New York City Coalition Against Hunger (the "Coalition").
Study Period	January 1998 - January 1999
Background	This report is the seventh annual survey of emergency food providers conducted by the Coalition, which represents 1,150 soup kitchens and food pantries in the metropolitan New York area.
Methodology	The Coalition surveyed 330 food programs (230 food pantries and 100 soup kitchens) in New York City.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• During January 1999, 74,280 New Yorkers were turned away from emergency food programs, a 27% increase over January of the prior year. • Of those turned away, 59% were children and 11% were elderly. This means that an estimated 1,400 children were turned away from emergency food programs every day. • 94% of the programs that turned away clients did so because they did not have enough food. To deal with food shortages, programs rationed their food supplies (41% of emergency food programs gave out less food to avoid turning others away). • 72% of respondents reported an increase in the number of families with children seeking emergency food assistance. Soup kitchens, which traditionally have served homeless adults, reported an increase in the number of families with children served, suggesting increased food insecurity or hunger among these households. • Emergency food requests in New York City increased 36% from January 1998 to January 1999. • 58% of emergency food service providers reported that welfare policies have increased the prevalence of hunger.
Obtaining the Report	For copies of the report, contact the Coalition at (212) 227-8480.

Oregon

1999 Hunger Relief Statistics

Oregon & Clark County, WA
October 1999

Author(s)	Oregon Food Bank.
Study Period	July 1998 - June 1999
Methodology	The food bank surveyed 18 independent regional food banks throughout Oregon and two regional distribution centers that distribute food to 680 soup kitchens, shelters, and other agencies in the Portland Metro area of Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, and Clark (WA) counties.
Key Hunger	• The number of people who received emergency food boxes increased 14% during fiscal

and Food Insecurity Findings	year 1998 to 458,208 (1 in 8 people in the region). On-site feeding programs (shelters and soup kitchens) served 10% more emergency meals compared to the prior fiscal year. • 41% of food box recipients were children, or 1 in 5 children in the region. • Despite recent declines in the poverty rates of Multnomah, Clackamas, Washington, and Clark (WA) counties, the number of people seeking emergency food in these counties increased by almost 23%.
Obtaining the Report	To obtain full copies of the report contact the Oregon Food Bank at (503) 282-0555.

Pennsylvania

Philabundance Agency Survey on Community Needs — June 1999

Author(s)	Philabundance.
Study Period	April 1998 – April 1999
Methodology	Philabundance conducted a telephone survey of 92 community food providers (out of 150 agencies). Respondents were from 6 counties (Bucks County, Camden County, Chester County, Delaware County, Montgomery County, and Philadelphia County).
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Of the community food providers surveyed, 67% reported increased demand for food assistance over the prior year, with the number of food requests increasing between 5% and 42%. Overall, the number of individuals seeking food assistance increased 18%. • 23% of providers reported turning away clients due to food shortages. • Respondents reported the following client household composition: 35% single parents with children; 8% two-parent families; 19% elderly adults; 35% childless adults; and 2% children not accompanied by parents. • The percentage of recipients who were children ranged from 57% in Bucks County to 24% in Philadelphia. • The number of adult recipients who had some type of employment ranged from 19% in Camden County to 64% in Montgomery County.
Obtaining the Report	For a full report, contact John Weidman at JWeidman@philabundance.org or (215) 339-0900, extension 251.

Virginia

Soup Kitchen and Food Pantry Users – Who Are They? — March 1999

Author(s)	Patricia McGrath Morris. Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy.
Study Period	October 1998
Background	In Virginia, an estimated 120,000 people receive food from pantries and soup kitchens each month. According to the report, food banks provide 25 million meals every year to food pantries and soup kitchens, which translates to approximately 2.1 million meals per month.
Methodology	Nine food pantries and 1 soup kitchen from each of the 7 food bank regions were invited to participate in the study. Food bank staff conducted in-person interviews with 15 randomly selected clients at each site. Fifty of the 70 sites returned completed surveys, for a total of 735 completed surveys. Respondents were asked to provide information on demographics, frequency of emergency food service use, and reasons why they sought assistance.

Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 90% of those who sought emergency food assistance went to food pantries. • Respondents sought emergency food assistance an average of 3.5 times a month. • When asked the main reason for seeking emergency food assistance, nearly two-thirds of recipients (63%) reported that they were either employed (28%) but couldn't make ends meet or were disabled (26%) or elderly (9%). The remaining respondents said they were seeking assistance because they were unemployed (34%) or had left welfare (3%). • 38% of respondents indicated that they skipped at least one meal during the 6-month period prior to the survey because they did not have enough money to buy food.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Patricia McGrath Morris at (703) 538-2546.

It Takes More than a Job – The Outlook for Virginians Leaving Welfare — March 2000

Author(s)	Patricia McGrath Morris. Virginia Center for Research on Social Welfare Policy.
Study Period	October – December 1999
Background	This study is the third annual state-wide survey of food pantry and soup kitchen clients in Virginia.
Methodology	Working households (N=321) and public assistance households (N=61) from a previous statewide survey of food pantry and soup kitchen clients were included in this study. The survey instrument contained one question to assess food security.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• One-half of working households who received food from pantries and soup kitchens earned $6.50 an hour or less. Only 25% of respondents reported having a household member who earned more than $8.00 per hour. • Nearly one-third (32%) of one-wage earner households reported skipping at least one meal during the 6-month period prior to the interview because they did not have enough money to buy food. This figure dropped to 20% for two-wage earner households. • A similar proportion of public assistance households (34%) skipped at least one meal.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Patricia McGrath Morris at (703) 538-2546.

Washington

13th Annual Client Survey – 1999 — October 1999

Author(s)	The Spokane Food Bank.
Study Period	August 1999
Background	As a regional distributor, the Spokane Food Bank has the largest service area of any of America's Second Harvest food banks in the continental United States. Reaching more than 280 service organizations in the region and tens of thousands of people, the Spokane Food Bank serves eastern Washington, northern Idaho and Montana.
Methodology	635 emergency food clients, representing 1,874 household members, completed in-person interviews at one of the food bank's 21 emergency food box outlets.
Key Hunger	• The number of clients seeking food assistance increased slightly in 1998-1999 to 13,250

and Food Insecurity Findings	persons per month (less than a 1% increase). However, the number of people using emergency food outlets for more than one year increased by 19%. • 50% of the parents surveyed went without a meal at least once during the last year so that their child or children could eat. • Nearly 40% of respondents reported that the head of the household worked full or part-time during the previous year. • The number of older clients (55 years and older) increased to 9% from 6% in 1998. Although there is a slow trend toward older populations using food assistance, more than 40% of food bank clients were still age 18 or younger. Of these clients, nearly 70% were age 12 or under. • 93% of emergency food clients in Spokane County lived below the poverty level; 36% of respondents received food stamps. • 50% of clients have relied on the emergency food outlet system for more than a year to make ends meet.
Obtaining the Report	Summary available at: http://www.spokanefoodbank.org/SFB_survey.htm. For more information about the survey, or to request a copy, contact Al Brislain or Connie Nelson at (509) 534-6678.

West Virginia

Meeting Necessity: A Statewide Survey of Food Pantries, Clothing Closets, Soup Kitchens, Shelters, Health Care, and Emergency Assistance Providers in West Virginia — **October 1999**

Author(s)	Carol Sharlip. West Virginia Economic Justice Project, American Friends Service Committee.
Study Period	July – August 1999
Background	In light of recent social policy changes, this study examined the degree to which community programs have been able to respond to the effects of social policy changes.
Methodology	Ninety completed 12-question surveys were returned from a mailing to 448 service providers in West Virginia (a response rate of 20%). Respondents provide services to every county in the state, and most organizations operate more than one type of program (including emergency assistance programs, food pantries, clothing closets, homeless, shelters, and health clinics). Respondents were asked to report on the number of clients served during each of the last two years (1997 and 1998).
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Of the 46 food pantries surveyed, 78% reported an increased demand for services, 9% reported a decrease, and 13% served approximately the same number of people the previous year. • Among those pantries reporting increased demand, the average increase in the number of clients served was 40%. • Half of the 10 programs that ran soup kitchens or provided meals reported an increased number of clients, with a 32% average increase. • Respondents cited 3 main factors as contributors to increased demand: welfare changes (56%), low wages (38%), and regional unemployment (35%). • 48% of providers reported that they have turned down requests for assistance.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Carol Sharlip at (304) 755-5929 or csharlip@citynet.net.

Wisconsin

State of Milwaukee's Children Report – 1999 **May 1999**

Author(s)	Start Smart Milwaukee!
Study Period	January - December 1998
Methodology	Data were compiled from secondary sources to provide information on early childhood education and quality child care, prenatal care and children's health, nutrition, child safety, support for parents, and family income/economic support.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• The Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee's Emergency Food Pantry served an average of 30,246 people per month in 1998. Over half of those served were children. This is less than the 42,000 people served by the Pantry network each month in 1996. • 59% of parents at the Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee's food pantries reported going without food to feed their children at some point during 1998. • In 1998, 73% of Milwaukee Public School students were eligible for free or reduced price lunches. This figure is unchanged from lunch benefits in 1994.
Obtaining the Report	For a copy of the report, contact Start Smart Milwaukee! at (414) 643-5477 or chc@execpc.com.

3 The Impact of Changes in Public Assistance Programs on Food Security

NATIONAL STUDIES

How Families That Left Welfare Are Doing: A National Picture — August 1999

Author(s)	Pamela Loprest. The Urban Institute.
Study Period	February – November 1997
Methodology	Using data from the 1997 NSAF (see page 16 for methodology), former welfare recipients, or "leavers," were compared with two groups of mothers who had not been on welfare in the last two years, but were not well-off. The two comparison groups selected were: (1) mothers with children under 18 and household incomes under 150% of the poverty level ("near-poor"), and (2) mothers with household incomes under 200% of poverty ("low-income").
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Former welfare recipients were more likely than near-poor and low-income mothers to struggle to provide sufficient food for their household. • About one-third of leavers (33%) cut the size of, or skipped, meals in the past year because there was not enough food, compared to 28% of near-poor households and 23% low-income households. • Nearly 57% of former recipients sometimes or often worried that food might run out before they had money to buy more, compared with about 45% of both near-poor and low-income families. • About 50% of former welfare recipients reported that food sometimes or often did not last, compared to 38% of near-poor households and 36% of low-income households. • Leavers were slightly less likely to have a wage earner in their families. This suggests that leavers may have less income as a group, which may partially explain why a greater percentage of former recipients struggled to provide food for their families compared to near-poor and low-income respondents.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://newfederalism.urban.org/html/series_b/anf_b1.html.

Current and Former Welfare Recipients: How Do They Differ? — November 1999

Author(s)	Pamela J. Loprest and Sheila R. Zedlewski. The Urban Institute.
Study Period	February – November 1997
Methodology	Using data from the 1997 National Survey of America's Families (NSAF) (see page 16 for methodology), this study compares the outcomes for former welfare recipients (those who received benefits since 1995, but were not receiving any at the time of the interview) with current recipients (those receiving benefits at the time of their interview).
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity	• Both current and former welfare recipients reported similar levels of food insecurity. Similar proportions of both groups reported cutting meal size or skipping meals because of insufficient food (35% of current recipients vs. 33% of former recipients).

Findings	insufficient food (35% of current recipients vs. 33% of former recipients). • 67% of current recipients, compared to 57% of former recipients, reported that they often or sometimes worried that food would run out before they had money to buy more. • 61% of current recipients and 50% of former recipients reported that it was often or sometimes true that food did not last and that they did not have money to buy more. • In general, former welfare recipients demonstrated as much anxiety about their economic position as current recipients did.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://newfederalism.urban.org/html/discussion-99-17.html.

STATE STUDIES

Arizona

Arizona Cash Assistance Exit Study **January 2000**

Author(s)	Karen L. Westra and John Routley. Arizona Department of Economic Security, Office of Evaluation.
Study Period	January – March 1998
Background	The number of families receiving cash assistance in Arizona declined from approximately 70,000 families in 1995 to 34,000 families by January 1999.
Methodology	Two random samples were drawn from administrative data on all cases that closed between January and March 1998, one for cases closed due to sanctions (N=405) and one for cases closed for other reasons (N=416). Surveys were administered over the telephone or in person to individuals without telephones. The study had a 72% response rate.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 30% of all respondents indicated that there was not enough to eat at times prior to exiting, while 24% reported that this was true after exiting. • Similar percentages of respondents before and after exiting received money or food from family or friends (24% vs. 21%, respectively), and from religious organizations (15% vs. 12%, respectively). • Prior to exiting, 29% of respondents received food from shelters or food banks compared to 21% of respondents after leaving the program. • The percentage of respondents whose children received free or discounted meals differed based on whether respondents were sanctioned or non-sanctioned. Before their exit, 70% of sanctioned respondents' children received free or reduced-cost meals compared to 59% of non-sanctioned respondents prior to exit.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.de.state.az.us/links/reports/exitstudy.html.

California

A Report on the Impacts of the Implementation of the Five Month Time Limit on General Relief Cash Benefits in Los Angeles County **L.A. County April 1999**

Author(s)	Shelter Partnership, Inc.
Study Period	Phase 1: October - December 1998; Phase 2: January - February 1999
Background	In February 1998, L.A. County reduced its General Relief (GR) assistance to "employable" recipients to 5 out of every 12 months. GR benefits include cash aid, food stamps, health care, and other services. Five months later, in June 1998, 6,352 individuals were terminated from the GR program. From July 1998 through February 1999, approximately 15,000 individuals lost their GR benefits.
Methodology	Homeless service agency staff administered surveys to 102 individuals who lost their GR benefits. Questions investigated the effects of GR cash benefit loss on key areas of respondents' lives, including their housing, food, and employment situation, and reliance on

	support networks for cash and non-cash assistance.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 31% of respondents reported living in a homeless shelter while receiving cash benefits. After the loss of benefits, this percentage nearly doubled to 61%. • 63% of respondents reported that they experienced more hunger after rather than prior to the loss of cash benefits. • Only 56% of all respondents ate at least two meals per day after losing their cash benefits compared with 98% of all respondents prior to losing benefits. • 95% of respondents received food stamps prior to losing cash benefits; only 48% reported receiving them after losing benefits.
Obtaining the Report	Executive Summary available at: http://www.shelterpartnership.org/homelessness/grreprt.htm. To order the full report contact the Shelter Partnership at (213) 688-2188 or office@shelterpartnership.org.

The Impact of Time Limits on General Relief Recipients in Los Angeles County: Survey Findings — **L.A. County, April 1999**

Author(s)	Ailee Moon and Rebecca Hawes, UCLA School of Public Policy and Social Research, Department of Social Welfare; Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness; and the Institute for the Study of Homelessness and Poverty.
Study Period	October 1998 - February 1999
Background	In February 1998, L.A. County reduced its General Relief (GR) assistance to "employable" recipients to 5 out of every 12 months. GR benefits include cash aid, food stamps, health care, and other services. Five months later, in June 1998, 6,352 individuals were terminated from the GR program. From July 1998 through February 1999, approximately 15,000 individuals lost their GR benefits.
Methodology	174 in-person interviews with former GR recipients were conducted. Only those respondents who had been discontinued for at least 3 months were eligible to participate. Respondents were asked to compare their circumstances in the 3 months before and after GR termination.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Before the discontinuation of GR, 81% of respondents reported eating at least 2 meals most days. After the loss of benefits, this percentage dropped to 32%. This means that, after losing GR benefits, two-thirds of respondents had fewer than 2 meals a day on most days. • Almost three-quarters (72%) of respondents reported increased hunger after the discontinuation of GR; 24% reported no change; and 4% reported being less hungry. • 86% of respondents received food stamps during their final 3 months of GR, while only 30% received food stamps after benefit termination. • Of those respondents who continued to receive food stamps after GR termination, 59% reported that they did not have at least two meals on most days after GR termination, compared to 14% of those who received food stamps before GR discontinuation. This suggests that GR cash income may have a greater impact on the ability to meet food needs than food stamps. • Of the respondents holding jobs at the time of the interview, 59% did not have at least two meals on most days following GR losses compared to 75% of unemployed respondents. • Prior to the loss of benefits, 81% reported buying and preparing their own food, while only 38% reported this practice after losing assistance. • Prior to GR cuts, 30% of respondents obtained food at missions or soup kitchens while 42% obtained food from these sources after cuts. The percentage of respondents obtaining food at homeless shelters also increased from 53% prior to GR discontinuation to 62% after.

Obtaining the Report	To order the report, contact the Los Angeles Coalition to End Hunger and Homelessness at (213) 439-1070 or lacehh@earthlink.net.

From War on Poverty to War on Welfare: The Impact of Welfare Reform on the Lives of Immigrant Women

Santa Clara County
April 1999

Author(s)	Equal Rights Advocates' Immigrant Women and Welfare Project.
Study Period	September - December 1998
Background	This study examines the impact of CalWORKS, California's welfare reform program, on immigrant women.
Methodology	Researchers conducted in-person surveys with 150 non-citizen Mexican and Vietnamese women receiving welfare. The survey investigated perceived barriers to economic self-sufficiency, experiences with CalWORKS, food sufficiency and security, and other needs.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• About 50% of Mexican women and 27% of Vietnamese women reported that they often or sometimes had insufficient food. • Though many of the Vietnamese respondents indicated that they never lacked sufficient food, many of them proceeded to describe how they coped when food ran out.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.equalrights.org/welfare/iwwp/fullrprt.pdf.

Connecticut

Connecticut Post-Time Limit Tracking Study: Three-Month Survey Results

September 1998

Author(s)	Jo Anna Hunter-Manns, Dan Bloom, Richard Hendra, and Johanna Walter. Manpower Demonstration Research Corporation.
Study Period	January - April 1998
Background	Connecticut's cash assistance program for needy families with children, Temporary Family Assistance (TFA), eliminated benefits in late 1997 for families that reached the 21-month time limit.
Methodology	Cases that reached the time limit in 1997 and with no extension were selected from 6 Department of Social Service district offices (Bridgeport, Hartford, Manchester, New Haven, Norwich, and Waterbury). Respondents (N=421) completed a telephone interview three months after their benefits were discontinued regarding their status in the month prior to the interview as well as changes since their last month of benefit receipt. The survey included 4 questions from the Census Bureau's Food Security Supplement.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 22% of respondents indicated that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat. • Of the 22% of the sample that indicated that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat, 56% responded that it was often or sometimes true that the food did not last and there was insufficient money to buy more during their last month of benefit receipt. Three months after benefit termination, 96% reported that this was often or sometimes true. • After benefit discontinuation, 61% of respondents often or sometimes relied on low-cost food to feed their children compared to 45% during the last month of benefit receipt. • Of those reporting food insufficiency (those who "often" or "sometimes" did not have enough

	to eat), more than one-third (36%) reported a monthly income below $500. In addition, 61% of food insufficient respondents did not have another adult in their household and 78% said they were employed when their welfare benefits were discontinued. • After benefit termination, 31% of respondents borrowed or received food from friends or relatives, and 15% received food from a church, soup kitchen, or food bank. Over half (55%) of these respondents reported engaging in these activities more in the month prior to the interview than during their last month of benefit receipt.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.mdrc.aa.psiweb.com/Reports/Connecticut3-MonthWrkPpr/CN-3-MonthWorkingPpr.html.

Florida

After WAGES: Results of the Florida Study — March 1999

Author(s)	Robert E. Crew, Jr. and Joe Eyerman. Florida State University.
Study Period	October 1998 – February 1999
Background	In 1996, Florida implemented its new welfare program - the Work & Gain Economic Self-Sufficiency (WAGES) program. This study examined the living circumstances of people who received cash benefits from the WAGES program sometime during 1996 through 1998, but subsequently left the program.
Methodology	A telephone survey was administered to 4,529 out of the 277,810 individuals who left the WAGES program between October 1996 and October 1998.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 43% of respondents said that, since leaving the WAGES program, there were times when they were unable to afford to buy food. • Those who received food stamps were just as likely to report being unable to afford food as those who did not participate in the Food Stamp Program.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.wages.org/wages/news/docs/FSUstudy.pdf.

Georgia

Georgia Welfare Leavers Study Initial Results — December 1999

Author(s)	E. Michael Foster and Dana K. Rickman. Applied Research Center, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University.
Study Period	June 1999 – November 1999
Background	This report provides initial results of an on-going project to monitor the impact of leaving welfare on individuals, their families, and their communities. The project will interview approximately 200 leavers per month through June 2001.
Methodology	Information on leavers, defined as cases not receiving cash assistance for 2 months, was based on administrative data and a telephone survey. The survey included child-only cases and individuals returning to welfare during the course of the study as well as those who did not return during the study period. Respondents (N=578; 463 single-parent respondents, 113 child-only respondents, 2 two-parent families) were asked about the food adequacy of their households

	over the prior 12-month period.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 45% of leavers reported that they often or sometimes worried that food would run out before they had money to purchase more. • Only 23% of single-parent leavers indicated that they had enough food and the kind of food they wanted, while 44% reported that they had enough to eat, but not always the kind of food they wanted. • One-third of single-parent respondents reported that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat. Of these respondents, 40% sought food assistance from friends and relatives, 36% sought assistance from their church, and 18% went to shelters or food kitchens for assistance. • 33% of single-parent leavers reported that they sometimes or often did not have enough to eat compared to 5% of the single-parents who were receiving benefits.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.arc.gsu.edu/tanf/report.pdf. Technical appendices available at: http://www.arc.gsu.edu/tanf/techapp.PDF.

Illinois

When Families Leave Welfare Behind – First Survey Findings — 1999

Author(s)	George Julnes and Anthony Halter. Institute for Public Affairs, University of Illinois at Springfield in collaboration with School of Social Work, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
Study Period	November – December 1998 .
Background	This study examines the characteristics of clients leaving Illinois' TANF program, what happens to them after exiting the program, and the factors associated with job-related outcomes.
Methodology	From a stratified random sample of 1,399 TANF leavers (cases who left TANF in either December 1997 or June 1998), 427 telephone interviews were completed. Leavers were defined as cases that remained closed for at least 2 months. Administrative data were analyzed in addition to survey data.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 33% of respondents reported that they were unable to afford food before leaving TANF compared to 25% after leaving welfare. • Cases who returned to TANF after at least 2 months (20% of the total sample) were asked an open-ended question about why they returned. Of the 82 cases who responded, the most common reason (23%) cited was the need to feed and support their children.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://uisadmin.uis.edu/IPA/publications/tanf_01.pdf.

Living With Welfare Reform: A Survey of Low-Income Families in Illinois — January 2000

Author(s)	Work, Welfare and Families and the Chicago Urban League with the Center for Urban Economic Development at the University of Illinois at Chicago.
Study Period	Late Fall 1998 – January 1999
Background	In Illinois, the TANF caseload declined from 188,069 cases in July 1997 to 139,806 in December 1998, a decline of 26%.
Methodology	Data were collected from three sources: (1) a self-administered survey of 2,166 low-income

	clients, which included welfare recipients and non-recipients, from 19 social service organizations, (2) Illinois Department of Human Services records, and (3) focus groups. Data on the ability to purchase food came from the survey.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Former welfare recipients were significantly more likely to be unable to purchase groceries than current recipients, regardless of whether or not individuals from either group were working. The percentage of recipients who reported that they could not buy groceries was 35% (101 of 291) compared to 60% among former recipients (61 of 102). • Respondents who had TANF *eliminated* due to earned income (N=56) were significantly more likely to report being unable to buy groceries compared to respondents who had their TANF benefits *reduced* because of such income (59% vs. 38%). • Respondents whose benefits were reduced or eliminated because of non-compliance were significantly more likely to be unable to buy groceries than those respondents who experienced no change in TANF benefits (54% vs. 29%).
Obtaining the Report	Executive summary available at: http://www.workwelfareandfamilies.org/execsum.html. Contact Work, Welfare and Families through e-mail (wwf@workwelfareandfamilies.org) or call (312) 986-4220 to receive a copy of the full report by mail.

Massachusetts

How Are They Doing? A Longitudinal Study of Households Leaving Welfare Under Massachusetts Reform

April 1999

Author(s)	Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance (DTA).
Study Period	January - June 1997
Background	In November 1995, Massachusetts implemented its reformed welfare program, Transitional Aid to Families with Dependent Children (TAFDC). A two-year time limit went into effect for certain recipients in December 1996 and the first recipients reached this time limit in December 1998.
Methodology	DTA staff completed 341 interviews (the majority by phone) from 647 randomly selected cases in Round One, approximately three months after case closure. DTA attempted to re-contact the same households every 3 months for one year. Due to follow-up losses, staff interviewed 215 of the sample by Round Four. Food security questions were only asked of households whose TAFDC case remained closed at the time of the interview (N=279 for Round One, N=170 for Round Four). Respondents were asked to compare their household's food situation after leaving TAFDC with their circumstances during the last 3 months that they received TAFDC benefits. To assess food security, DTA asked 4 questions related to the amount of food in the household, the number of days without food, the use of free food, and the receipt of money from others for food.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	**Round One - 3 months after leaving TAFDC** • 86% of respondents never went without food during their last 3 months on assistance or during the most recent 3 months without TAFDC benefits. 6% of cases reported going without food both with and without assistance; 4% indicated that they went without food while on TAFDC but not after; and 4% reported going without food after leaving assistance but not while they received assistance. • Although the same percent of cases (but not necessarily the same cases) reported going without food before and after leaving TAFDC (10%), the number of days respondents went without food increased after leaving TAFDC, suggesting that the degree of insecurity worsened during this time for some food insecure households. • The use of food supports, including food banks, food from a church, shelter, or kitchen, or

	the receipt of money for food, during the last 3 months of assistance was similar to the 3 months after assistance discontinuation (37% vs. 36%, respectively). **Round Four - One year after leaving TAFDC** • Overall, 31% of households surveyed upgraded their food security status; 16% downgraded their status; and 53% reported no change. • Fewer cases interviewed at the 1-year mark reported food insecurity than at the 3-month mark. In Round Four, 59% of cases reported that they had enough of the right kinds of food, compared to 52% in Round One. Although 22% of Round One respondents reported not having enough food, this figure dropped to 7% of respondents in Round Four. • 79% of cases used no food assistance (free food or money from others for food) during the three months before the Round Four interview.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.state.ma.us/dta/dtatoday/reform/LongitudinalStudy.pdf.

Food Stamp Participation and Food Security of Households Leaving Welfare — **February 2000**

Author(s)	Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance.
Study Period	March – May 1999
Methodology	From 873 randomly selected households whose cases closed between September 1, 1998 and November 14, 1998, 582 former welfare recipients were interviewed. Data on Food Stamp Program participation, well-being, employment, income, household structure, food security, and food assistance were collected. To assess food security, researchers used a modified version of the USDA's 6-item food security scale. Respondents were asked to report on their household's circumstances during the last 3 months on welfare and since leaving welfare.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 31% of respondents were classified as food insecure after leaving welfare compared to 28% of respondents classified as food insecure during their final 3 months on welfare. • Although 10% of households improved their food security status after leaving welfare, the food security situation of 14% of households grew worse after leaving welfare. • 12% of respondents reported that an adult household member went hungry at one time during their last 3 months on welfare. In comparison, 19% of respondents reported adult hunger after they stopped receiving welfare benefits. • 8% of respondents reported that their children went hungry after leaving welfare compared to 5% of respondents who reported this occurrence during the last 3 months on welfare. • After leaving welfare, 42% of households determined to be potentially eligible for food stamps were food insecure compared to 27% of food stamp recipient households and 26% of households determined to be ineligible or whose status was unknown. • All three groups reported increased adult hunger after leaving welfare, with the largest increase among households possibly eligible for food stamps but not receiving them. 25% of these households experienced adult hunger, an increase of 10%. The percentage of possibly food stamp eligible households that experienced child hunger increased 7% after leaving welfare to 14%. • During the last 3 months on welfare, 46% of respondents used one or more private food assistance programs compared to 43% of respondents who did so after leaving welfare. Family and friends were by far the most common source of food assistance, followed by food banks and food pantries. • Of the 250 households that received private food assistance after leaving welfare, 55%

	were classified as food insecure.
Obtaining the Report	For copies of the report, contact Bruce Godro, Massachusetts Department of Transitional Assistance, 617-348-5427.

Missouri

The Study of Families Formerly Receiving Aid to Families with Dependent Children – Interim Report: 1999 Survey

May 1999

Author(s)	Midwest Research Institute for the Missouri Department of Social Services.
Study Period	March – April 1999
Background	This report presents initial findings from interviews with about 25% of a group of former AFDC recipients who stopped receiving AFDC in the fourth quarter of 1996. The final report will cover the full 1996 sample (N=1,200) as well as a sample of recipients who left TANF in the fourth quarter of 1997 (N=1,200).
Methodology	304 respondents from the 1996 cohort who were easily reachable by phone completed surveys. The survey includes 151 items that cover 10 topic areas, including questions about the ability to buy enough food and whether children skipped meals.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Although 45% of households used food stamps and 50% of households with children under age 5 received WIC benefits during the month prior to the interview, 25% of the respondents reported that there had been a time in the previous month when their household was unable to buy enough food to meet its needs. • 4% of respondents indicated that their children skipped a meal in the previous month because there was not enough money to buy food.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://aspe.os.dhhs.gov/hsp/leavers99/mri_leavers2.pdf.

Ohio

How Are They Managing? A Six Month Retrospective of Cuyahoga County Families Leaving Welfare

January 2000

Author(s)	Claudia Coulton, Cara Pasqualone, Neil Bania, Toby Martin, Nina Lalich, Margaret Fernando, and Fang Li. Center on Urban Poverty and Social Change, Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences, Case Western Reserve University.
Study Period	Fourth quarter of 1998 and first quarter of 1999
Background	The purpose of this study is to determine how families are faring as a result of welfare reform in Ohio. Similar studies will continue through the first quarter of 2001.
Methodology	Beginning in the fourth quarter of 1998, families that left cash assistance for at least 2 months were identified from quarterly agency records. A random sample from each 2-month leaver cohort completed a telephone interview 6 months and then 13 months after exiting. This report covers "exiters" from the fourth quarter of 1998 and the first quarter of 1999 cohorts. For both quarters combined, a total of 198 interviews were completed, for a response rate of 70%. One question about missed or cut meals by adults was used as part of the study's measurement of material hardship.
Key Hunger	• Over one-quarter (28%) of respondents missed or cut meals during the 6 months after

and Food Insecurity Findings	exiting. • In the month prior to the 6-month interview, 7% of respondents used some type of emergency service.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://povertycenter.cwru.edu/Q4_1_REPORT1.PDF.

South Carolina

Survey of Former Family Independence Program Clients: Cases Closed During January through March, 1998 — **June 1999**

Author(s)	South Carolina Department of Social Services.
Study Period	January – April 1999
Background	South Carolina implemented its revised welfare reform program in 1996. This study is the sixth in a series of survey reports on former clients.
Methodology	Cases closed between January 1, 1998 and March 31, 1998 were included in the sample (N=384) only if they had not returned to welfare since their case was closed and if at least one household member was an able-bodied adult required to seek employment while receiving welfare.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Prior to leaving welfare, 6% of respondents reported that there were times when they had no money to buy food. During the year after leaving welfare, 13% of respondents reported instances when they had no money to buy food. • The most common sources of food assistance were friends and relatives (67% on welfare, 65% after welfare), followed by church assistance (25% on welfare, 18% after welfare) or help from a shelter or food pantry (17% on welfare, 20% after welfare). • No family reported going hungry while on welfare, and only one household reported going hungry after leaving welfare. • When asked why they did not have money to purchase food after leaving welfare (N=51), 28% of households said that food stamps were insufficient to pay for food; 18% had either unexpected or emergency expenses or "other" reasons; and 16% either spent all of their money on things other than food or lost a job. • 22% of respondents were not aware that they could continue to receive food stamps after leaving welfare.
Obtaining the Report	Contact Jerry Adams, Office of Public Affairs, at (803) 898-7602 or jadams@dss.state.sc.us.

Texas

Why People Leave Welfare II: An Expanded Follow-Up Study of the Effects of Welfare Reform

December 1998

Author(s)	Carol Nemir, Richard Sanders, and Don Warren. Texas Legislative Council.
Study Period	October 1997 – January 1998
Background	From 1994 to March 1998, Texas' monthly TANF caseload declined from 790,100 to 463,975 (41%). The report investigates the experiences of program participants and provides information on the progress of welfare reform in Texas.
Methodology	A stratified random sample containing both current and former welfare recipients received a mail survey in both English and Spanish. Of the 2,274 delivered surveys, 1,460 were returned for an overall response rate of 64%.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Former recipients reported greater difficulty providing adequate food for their families compared to current recipients. • 9% of former welfare recipients reported that their families often do not get enough to eat compared to 3% of current recipients. • Former welfare recipients living near the Texas-Mexico border areas were more likely than respondents not living near the border to report that their families *sometimes* do not get enough to eat (35% vs. 25%); however, border families were less likely to report that their families *often* do not get enough to eat (5% vs. 10%). • Although 95% of respondents received food stamps concurrently with TANF benefits, only 56% of former TANF clients reported that they still receive food stamps. • There was no difference between single-parent and two-parent households in terms of their reported ability to provide sufficient food for their families. However, recipients in two-parent families were more likely than those in single-parent families to receive food stamps after leaving welfare (69% vs. 55%).
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.tlc.state.tx.us/tlc/research/pdf/welfare2.pdf.

Washington

Washington's TANF Single Parent Families After Welfare

1998

Author(s)	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.
Study Period	First Survey: April – May 1998; Second Survey: October – November 1998
Background	Washington's new welfare program, WorkFirst, was implemented in November 1997. The first time limits took effect in August 1997. This report compares the findings of 2 consecutive surveys conducted in 1998 of families that left WorkFirst.
Methodology	The first survey included single-parent households exiting TANF between December 1997 and March 1998 (N=560). The second survey consisted of single-parent households exiting TANF between April and August of 1998 (N=592). Additional questions to assess perceived household insecurity, including food insecurity, were added to the second survey. Three questions from the USDA Food Security Supplement were used to assess food security. The food security status reported covers the period from April - November 1998. Data were collected through a telephone survey and a review of available existing administrative data.

Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• When asked which resources families used after they left welfare, 42% of all families who exited in March 1998, and 45% of families who left welfare in August 1998 reported using food stamps. Food banks were used by 22% of those who exited in March, and 29% who left welfare in August. Of the households exiting between April and August 1998: • 33% reported cutting meal sizes sometimes or often, with 12% cutting meals for both adults and children. • 16% reported skipping meals sometimes or often, and in 4% both adults and children skipped meals. • 8% reported going without food for at least one day on at least one occasion.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/about/98final.pdf.

Major Findings from Washington's Third TANF Exit Survey **November 1999**

Author(s)	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.
Study Period	April – June 1999
Background	In March 1998, Washington began to track families leaving TANF. As of June 1999, 3 TANF exit groups had completed telephone interviews. This report compares the results of the third exit survey to the first two.
Methodology	The first survey covered individuals exiting in March 1998, while the second survey covered August 1998 exits. The third survey interviewed individuals who exited in October 1998 (N=572). The third exit group had been off TANF longer at the time they were interviewed (6 to 8 months) compared to the previous two groups (1 to 3 months). The third survey had an overall response rate of 73%.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• The number of people who reported that they sometimes or often cut back on meal portions went from 33% in the second survey (August 1998 exiters) to 43% in the third (October 1998 exiters). Similarly, the percentage of respondents who sometimes or often skipped meals rose to nearly 25% from 16%, and 14% of former recipients went without food for at least one day, compared to 8% of respondents in the second survey. • In the third survey, 13% of respondents experienced hunger compared to 8% of respondents from the second survey, a statistically significant difference. • In the third survey, 31% of former welfare recipients interviewed reported that they used food banks in the last 6 months compared to 29% in the second survey and 22% in the first survey.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/about/ExitNov99.pdf.

Washington's 1999 TANF Exiters and Current Recipients – Survey Results **November 1999**

Author(s)	Washington State Department of Social and Health Services.
Study Period	April – June 1999
Background	In March 1998, Washington began to track families that left TANF. As of June 1999, three TANF exit groups had been interviewed. This survey included a comparison group of current recipients who received welfare continuously for at least 6 months as of April 1999.

Methodology	Former TANF recipients (N=572) and current recipients (N=453) completed telephone surveys for an overall response rate of 73%. TANF exiters had been off TANF for 6 to 8 months after exiting in October 1998, and TANF recipients had been on TANF for at least 7 to 8 months. To be consistent with the two previous exit surveys, this report *excludes* 136 (19%) TANF exiters who returned to TANF and 73 (14%) current recipients who left TANF by the time of the survey. (For a summary of results that include those who returned to TANF as part of the TANF exit group and those who left TANF by the time of the survey, see "A Study of Washington State TANF Leavers and TANF Recipients" below.)
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• Respondents who left TANF reported more food insecurity and hunger compared to current TANF recipients. This included cutting meals sometimes or often (43% vs. 38%); skipping meals sometimes or often (24% vs. 23%); and going without food for at least one day (14% vs. 10%). • 13% of exiters reported experiencing hunger compared to 8% of current recipients. • 43% of current recipients reported using food banks in the last 6 months compared to 31% of former recipients. • More current welfare recipients obtained free or reduced-price school meals for their children than exiters (64% vs. 49%).
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/about/onvsoffsurvey.pdf.

A Study of Washington State TANF Leavers and TANF Recipients **March 2000**

Author(s)	Jean Du, Debra Fogarty, Devin Hopps, and James Hu. Office of Planning and Research, Economic Services Administration, Washington Department of Social and Health Services.
Study Period	April – June 1999
Background	Between July 1997 and June 1999, Washington's TANF caseload declined by 31% from 88,221 to 60,705. The purpose of this study was to gain a better understanding of the well-being of clients leaving assistance.
Methodology	Single-parent families who exited TANF in October 1998 and did not receive TANF benefits in October or November 1998 (N=708), as well as single-parent family recipients who continued on TANF for the subsequent six months (N=527), were interviewed. Those households without telephones were given alternative ways of participating in the survey. The survey instrument included questions on whether families cut their meal size, skipped meals, or went without food all day because there was not enough money for food.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 43% of respondents who left TANF and 39% of respondents on TANF indicated that they cut their meal size sometimes or often. • 27% of leavers skipped meals sometimes or often compared with 22% of those receiving TANF benefits. • 15% of leavers went without food all day at least once compared to 11% of those on TANF. • A significantly higher percentage of adult leavers experienced food shortages compared to adults receiving TANF benefits. There was no significant difference between the percentage of leavers and TANF respondents who lived in households where *both* adults and children experienced food reductions or shortages. • 35% of TANF leavers and 44% of those still receiving TANF benefits indicated that they used food banks in the 6 months prior to the interview.
Obtaining the Report	Report available at: http://www.wa.gov/WORKFIRST/about/Exit3Report.pdf.

Wisconsin

Initial Findings on the Impact of Wisconsin Works on Food Security and Employment

Milwaukee
August 1998

Author(s)	Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee in cooperation with the Hunger Action Team.
Study Period	January - March 1998
Background	Wisconsin Works (W-2) is the state's work-based replacement for AFDC. W-2 was implemented in September 1997.
Methodology	This study presents results from two surveys. The first survey measured the work search and employment experiences of 305 low-income households. The second measured participation in the Works program as well as food security among 632 respondents. Food security was assessed by asking about food-seeking behaviors, delays in paying bills in order to buy food, serving smaller portions or cheaper foods, skipping meals to feed children, and participation in illegal activities to get food. Surveys were administered at emergency food pantries and meal programs affiliated with the Hunger Task Force of Milwaukee.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	The second survey found that: • 56% of respondents received food stamps in the year prior to the survey. Of these recipients, 19% no longer received food stamps, and 41% received fewer food stamps benefits. • Employed W-2 participants appeared to be more food insecure than unemployed W-2 participants. • Respondents enrolled in W-2 and working used alternative methods of obtaining additional food more than unemployed W-2 participants or non-participants. 91% of employed W-2 participants utilized food pantries compared to 80% of unemployed participants and non-participants. In addition, working W-2 participants were more likely to receive food from a friend or relative (74%), delay paying bills or rent to buy food (77%), serve cheaper food or smaller servings (74%), have adults who did not eat in order to feed their children (65%), or do something illegal to obtain food or money for food (16%). • Sizable percentages of respondents reported participating in these alternative methods of obtaining food for the first time in 1997. Many people who previously used these methods for getting extra food or money to buy food reported engaging in these behaviors with greater frequency.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.jsonline.com/news/hungertask.stm.

Survey of Those Leaving AFDC or W-2
January to March 1998, Preliminary Report

January 1999

Author(s)	Wisconsin Department of Workforce Development and the University of Wisconsin's Survey Research Laboratory.
Study Period	August 21 - November 6, 1998
Background	Wisconsin Works (W-2) is the state's work-based replacement for AFDC. W-2 was implemented in September 1997. This study includes individuals who were part of the transition from the old AFDC system to W-2. The study investigated employment, earnings, perceptions of the welfare system, family well-being, and receipt of additional services or benefits (transportation, childcare, and medical insurance), and food security.
Methodology	From September 1997 through March 1998, recipients of AFDC were terminated and invited to apply for W-2, although some chose not to apply. This study covers individuals who, as of the first quarter of 1998, had either left AFDC or who had been terminated after moving from AFDC to W-2. A sample of 547 was drawn randomly from a total of 3,564 closed AFDC or W-2 cases. From this sample, 375 respondents completed a telephone or in-person interview. For information about food security issues, respondents were asked about problems experienced buying food both before and after leaving welfare and about the types of food-related assistance received after welfare.
Key Hunger and Food Insecurity Findings	• 45% (169) of the respondents said that there have been times when they were unable to purchase food. This occurred for 22% of the respondents while on welfare, and for 32% after welfare. (The percentage total is greater than 45% because some respondents were unable to purchase food both before and after welfare.) • Of all "leavers" surveyed, 22% reported difficulties purchasing food while receiving welfare benefits, while 32% reported difficulties after welfare benefit termination. • Of those who reported instances of being unable to purchase food either while on welfare or after benefit termination, 76% reported going to either a church, food pantry, food kitchen, or shelter at some point; 65% went to friends and relatives; 8% reportedly sought assistance from other unidentified sources; and 6% reported going hungry. • After leaving welfare, respondents primarily used 5 governmental food programs: 49% received food stamps; 47% had children participating in the School Lunch Program; 38% received WIC services; 13% used food pantries; and 5% had children who participated in the Summer Feeding Program. • 34% of respondents reported not knowing that they might qualify to receive food stamps after leaving welfare.
Obtaining the Report	Full report available at: http://www.dwd.state.wi.us/desw2/leavers1.pdf.

Appendix

USDA's Food Security Core Module (FSCM)

The Food Security Core Module (FSCM) is the first officially sanctioned household measure of food insecurity and hunger in the United States. It provides a consistent basis for comparing food insecurity and hunger prevalence over time and across different populations.

The measure is based on research showing that households typically adopt a series of coping strategies in response to food insecurity. The continuum of coping strategies begins with a household head experiencing anxiety about food insufficiency, leading to decisions to reduce the household's food budget by altering the quality or variety of food consumed by the family. As the situation worsens, adults in the household begin to experience hunger due to reduced food intake, and in the most severe circumstances, both children and adults experience hunger.

The FSCM consists of an 18-item survey instrument constructed as a scale measure. The items ask about the household's experiences of increasingly severe circumstances of food insufficiency and the behaviors undertaken in response to them during the 12-month period preceding the survey. The least severe items ask whether the household has worried about or experienced a situation where food was running out, and there was no money to buy more. The most severe items indicate reduced food intakes and hunger for children in the household or more severe hunger for adults.

Based on the particular pattern of response to all 18 questions, each household is classified into one of four food security status categories: 1) food secure, 2) food insecure without hunger, 3) food insecure with moderate hunger evident, and 4) food insecure with severe hunger evident.

For research efforts with time and/or financial constraints that make using the full scale difficult, an abbreviated 6-item scale has been developed by researchers at the National Center for Health Statistics. The 6 items are a subset of the full 18-item version and, like the full scale, capture a range of household responses to inadequate resources for food. However, the "short form" does not allow for the separation of the moderate and severe hunger categories because it is unable to distinguish between the most severe cases in which children are going hungry from those cases in which adults have cut their food consumption.

A list of references on the USDA Food Security Core Module can be found at the end of this appendix.

Resources on Conducting Household Food Security Studies

Bickel, Gary, Steven Carlson, and Mark Nord (July 1999). *Household Food Security in the United States 1995 - 1998 (Advance Report).* Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/FSP/FILES/foodsec98.PDF.

Bickel, Gary, Mark Nord, Cristofer Price, William Hamilton, and John Cook (forthcoming). *Guide to Measuring Household Food Security, Revised 2000.* Alexandria, VA: Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

Blumberg Stephen J., Karil Bialostosky, William L. Hamilton, and Ronette R. Briefel. "The Effectiveness of a Short Form of the Household Food Security Scale." *American Journal of Public Health.* August 1999; 89 (8): 1231-1234.

Carlson, Steven J., Margaret S. Andrews, and Gary W. Bickel. "Measuring Food Insecurity and Hunger in the United States: Development of a National Benchmark Measure and Prevalence Estimates." *Journal of Nutrition.* February 1999; 129: 1S-7S.

Hamilton, William L., John T. Cook, William W. Thompson, Lawrence F. Buron, Edward A. Frongillo, Jr., Christine M. Olson, and Cheryl A. Wehler (September 1997). *Household Food Security in the United States 1995 - Summary Report of the Food Security Measurement Project.* Alexandria, VA: Office of Analysis, Nutrition, and Evaluation, Food and Nutrition Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Available at: http://www.fns.usda.gov/oane/MENU/Published/fsp/files/sumrpt.pdf.

Nord, Mark, Kyle Jemison, and Gary Bickel (September 1999). *Prevalence of Food Insecurity and Hunger, by State, 1996-98.* Food and Rural Economics Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). Food Assistance and Nutrition Research Report No. 2 (FANRR-2). Available at: http://www.ers.usda.gov/epubs/pdf/fanrr2/fanrr2.pdf.

Seavey, Dorie and Ashley F. Sullivan (April 1999). *Household Food Security Summaries - I.* Food Security Institute, Center on Hunger and Poverty, Tufts University.

Seavey, Dorie and Ashley F. Sullivan (2000 - forthcoming). *Household Food Security Summaries - II.* Food Security Institute, Center on Hunger and Poverty, Brandeis University.

* * * *

For additional technical information and references related to food security measurement, see the web sites of the Economic Research Service's Domestic Food Security and Hunger Briefing Room (http://www.ers.usda.gov/briefing/FoodSecurity/), and the Food Security Institute at the Center on Hunger and Poverty (http://www.centeronhunger.org).

Questions Included in the 18-Item Food Security Core Module (FSCM)

1. "(I/We) worried whether (my/our) food would run out before (I/we) got money to buy more." Was that often true, sometimes true, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

2. "The food that (I/we) bought just didn't last, and (I/we) didn't have money to get more." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

3. "(I/we) couldn't afford to eat balanced meals." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

4. "(I/we) relied on only a few kinds of low-cost food to feed (my/our) child/the children) because (I was/we were) running out of money to buy food." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

5. "(I/We) couldn't feed (my/our) child/the children) a balanced meal, because (I/we) couldn't afford that." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

6. "(My/Our child was/The children were) not eating enough because (I/we) just couldn't afford enough food." Was that often, sometimes, or never true for (you/your household) in the last 12 months?

7. In the last 12 months, since last (name of current month), did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

8. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

9. In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?

10. In the last 12 months, were you every hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?

11. In the last 12 months, did you lose weight because you didn't have enough money for food?

12. In the last 12 months, did (you/you or other adults in your household) ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

13. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

14. The next questions are about children living in the household who are under 18 years old. In the last 12 months, since (current month) of last year, did you ever cut the size of (your child's/any of the children's) meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

15. In the last 12 months, did (your child/any of the children) ever skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?

16. How often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?

17. In the last 12 months, (was your child/were the children) ever hungry but you just couldn't afford more food?

18. In the last 12 months, did (your child/any of the children) ever not eat for a whole day because there wasn't enough money for food?

Questions Included in the 6-Item Food Security Core Module (FSCM)

1. "In the last 12 months, did you (or other adults in your household) ever cut the size of your meals or skip meals because there wasn't enough money for food?"

2. "If yes, how often did this happen – almost every month, some months but not every month, or in only 1 or 2 months?"

3. "In the last 12 months, did you ever eat less than you felt you should because there wasn't enough money to buy food?"

4. "In the last 12 months, were you ever hungry but didn't eat because you couldn't afford enough food?"

5. "The food that [I/we] bought just didn't last, and [I/we] didn't have money to get more. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?"

6. "[I/We] couldn't afford to eat balanced meals. Was that often, sometimes, or never true for you in the last 12 months?"

Center on Hunger and Poverty
Heller Graduate School • Brandeis University
Mailstop 077 • P.O. Box 549110
Waltham, MA 02454-9110
Phone 781-736-8885 • Fax 781-736-3925
hunger@brandeis.edu